

THE  
**Congregational Quarterly.**

WHOLE No. XLVI.

APRIL, 1870.

VOL. XII. No. 2.

SILAS AIKEN.

THE subject of this sketch was the son of Phineas and Elizabeth (Patterson) Aiken, and was born in Bedford, N. H., May 14, 1799. The first of his family in this country was Edward Aiken, who came from the north of Ireland about 1722, and settled in Londonderry, N. H. His oldest son, Nathaniel, lived and died in the same place. John, the second son of Nathaniel, moved to Bedford, and was the father of Phineas, who was the father of Silas, the subject of our present writing. Phineas Aiken was a farmer owning some four hundred acres of land, and he bore a goodly name among the people. He served the country in the war of the Revolution. He was deacon of the Presbyterian Church and held offices of trust in his native town, and was representative to the General Court. He died April 18, 1836. His wife, the mother of Silas, was Elizabeth Patterson, of Amherst, N. H. She was a woman of strong mind and vigorous body. She survived her husband about twenty years, and died at the age of eighty-nine. "The family was one of known religious excellence and social respectability." There were nine children, several of whom have been distinguished for their sterling qualities of mind and heart.

Of the boyhood of Silas we are permitted to know but little. The few incidents which appear at that early age link themselves with later life. That trout-brook which ran near the old farm-house often engaged his youthful attention. The early hours often found him there taking his morning "string"; and in other years, when cares weighed him down, he

---

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1870, by SAMUEL BURNHAM, for the Proprietors, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

still held, with quaint Izaak Walton, that "God never did make a more calm, quiet, innocent recreation than angling." And the hours of his relief from heavy labor were often spent with the brooks that run among the mountains, or in rowing and trolling along the deep river, thus finding two joys in one. There is a deep, still river flowing through the intervale and fringed with the willow and maple; and the summer guests will long remember how he loved that quiet sail, or, what to him was better far, to pass out upon the bosom of fair Champlain.

The early experience on the farm gave him a taste for athletic sports, and he never outgrew his knowledge of the arts of husbandry, nor did he quit the use of the implements of the farm. In his boyhood he was strong and vigorous, never feeling weariness even in the heavy work and in summer's heat; and he often said, that until he entered his second pastorate he never knew fatigue. It was on account of his robust frame and his love for work that his father had intended that he should take the homestead, and it was a great self-denial to give him up when he determined to gain a more liberal education. At the age of nineteen he united with the church at Bedford, and about this time his attention was turned to the gospel ministry. He was influenced in this decision by the advice of Rev. Jonas Colburn, who was at that time a student at Andover.

It appears that he made some progress in education, spending his leisure hours in studying the Latin grammar, and that the rudiments of this language were thoroughly mastered while he was at home. But at the beginning of the academic year at Andover, one of the students in the seminary brought with him a young man to enter Phillips Academy, who is thus described, "of large size, muscular strength, and ruddy countenance. Though he said nothing at first, his appearance was such as to excite attention and remark." He had now fully committed himself to the purpose of fitting for the sacred ministry. He remained at Andover till fitted for college. "His grand characteristic as a scholar was thoroughness. He wanted to know all about every word, and if he could not learn all in private study he would surely compass it in the class." He engaged with zest in every investigation of difficult questions, and his teacher, Rev. J. Clement, D. D., says of him, "If his positive opinion chanced to be erroneous, he would, when convinced of it, laugh heartily at his own mistake, and would seem more pleased to be *proved* in the wrong than to be able to correct another." The examining committee were greatly pleased with his first annual examination.

There is little to be said of his subsequent career as a student in the academy and in college save that he maintained this same standard of scholarship. He entered Dartmouth College in 1821, and graduated in 1825, the valedictorian of his class. Among his classmates were such

men as Rev. Caleb S. Henry, D. D., Rev. George B. Manser, D. D., Hon. Isaac F. Redfield, LL. D., Andrew S. Woods, LL. D., and Professor Albert Smith, M. D., and others who have attained eminence in the world as scholarly men. During his collegiate course he supported himself in part by teaching in the winter vacations. He once taught in his native town, and had for a pupil Horace Greeley, whose birthplace was not far distant. At his graduation he was appointed tutor in his *Alma Mater*, and held the appointment for three years. It is said that he had wonderful control over the students, securing at once their respect and their love. During the three years of his tutorship he studied theology with Rev. Bennett Tyler, D. D., President of the college, and with Professor Howe.

He completed his studies preparatory to the ministry, and when on a visit at his father's he was invited to preach for a brother who was wearied with labor. There was a man in that congregation from the neighboring church at Amherst who was so well pleased with him that he induced the people to send for him as a candidate. The retiring pastor, "being well advised of his scholarly reputation as an undergraduate and afterwards as a tutor and student of divinity at the college," cordially received him and introduced him to the people on the last Sabbath of his residence among them.

After preaching a few Sabbaths he received a call to be settled as colleague with Rev. Jeremiah Barnard,<sup>1</sup> who had been pastor of the church since 1780. Amherst was at that time one of the most important towns of the State. It was the shire town of Hillsborough County. The great manufacturing interest was then in its infancy. Nashua was only beginning her great enterprises, and was little larger than the village of Nashville, since incorporated with it, having a population of only about twelve hundred. Manchester was even less, being only a suburb of the little village of Amoskeag, which in its turn has now assumed suburban relations to the growing city. In 1830 Manchester had not more than fifty inhabitants. The town of Amherst having sixteen hundred population, and being the residence of many of the leading families in the State, was an inviting field of labor.

Mr. Aiken was ordained over the Congregational Church at Amherst, N. H., March 4, 1829. He was the immediate successor of Rev. Nathan Lord, who had been elected President of Dartmouth College.

<sup>1</sup> Rev. Jeremiah Barnard commenced his ministry in the most trying period of the Revolution, and by his prayers and patriotic sentiments contributed to encourage the Christian patriots who fought at Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill. In 1780 he was settled as the junior pastor of the church in Amherst, N. H. In 1785, by the death of the Rev. David Wilkins, he became sole pastor. In 1816 Rev. Nathan Lord was associated with him as junior pastor. Mr. Barnard continued to be pastor of the church till his death in 1835, when, after a ministry of fifty-five years, in the fulness of time he was gathered to his fathers.

It is said by one who succeeded him in the pastoral office, that there was something peculiar in the character of the church and people, which leads one to discover a special providence in the bringing of these two men successively into that field of labor. In the early ministry of Dr. Lord there was very earnest discussion of religious doctrine. "It was a season of separation, of strife and debate in that community, as elsewhere in New England, in respect to the vital themes of Christian faith and practice. The points at issue were such as to involve the continuance of the fundamental views of the founders of the church, or the introduction of a more lax and indiscriminating system of belief. Happily for the interests of genuine piety, the former opinions prevailed; and the church entered, when the crisis was passed, on a new and vigorous career of activity under the distinct and able instruction of its accomplished minister. The twelve years' pastorate of Dr. Lord was eminently a forming period in the history of the congregation; a spring-time in which the fallow ground was broken and the fresh soil was liberally strewn with the good seed of the word of life.

Mr. Aiken entered the pastorate in what proved the midsummer of that generation, to take up the work which his predecessor had left, and carry on the husbandry into the rich and abundant harvest which soon followed. Dr. Lord had addressed the understanding and wrought deep convictions of the truth of what he affirmed. His successor appealed to the heart, and, as an ambassador of Christ, constrained men to accept the gospel. If he was less polished and exact in his methods of sermonizing, he nevertheless employed the truth with surpassing tenderness and power."

The early years of this pastorate were years of extraordinary encouragement to the churches of New England, and especially of New Hampshire. The church at Amherst shared fully and largely in this general revival. Dr. Aiken often spoke of this season as one of blessed memory. His tender heart would overflow as he recurred to those seasons of joyful labor and blissful communion. There are those who still remember with what deep emotion he spoke of those who were led to the Saviour in that early ministry; and some will remember a discourse about thirty years after in which he referred to this season. There was a peculiar light in his eye, for his whole soul thrilled with the memory, and tears of glad joy ran down his cheeks as he said: "That was a year of God's right hand throughout the land. Long shall I remember the strength and encouragement which that season brought to my own heart, occurring as it did soon after my first settlement in the ministry. I saw multitudes committed to my care pressing into the kingdom of God. I witnessed the efficacy of prayer, and realized as I had never before that it is *not by might nor by power*, but by the Spirit of God, that Zion is enlarged."



It is easy to see how the strength of body and the ability of his mind and the power of endurance in all thought and feeling were brought to the severest test. But he was found equal to these demands.

He held frequent meetings for prayer and religious discourse in the several school districts in connection with exhaustive labors from house to house. He also engaged in public religious services in the neighboring towns, where his preaching was largely useful and highly esteemed. From the circumstance of deep and tender spiritual interest attending his pastorate, he soon gained a strong hold upon the affections of the people. To a large number the word from his lips became a savor of life unto life. The earnestness, the tenderness, and the sincerity of his character appeared in all his ministry, and all his hearers were convinced at once that the words to which they listened were the utterance of his whole soul.

This was what gave power to his preaching. One who knew him well at that period speaks of him in these strong words:—

"He was of a stately and commanding figure, and his manner, though without studied or affected grace, was marked by a characteristic dignity and propriety. His voice was clear, distinct, full, and of large compass. His countenance in repose signified thoughtfulness and sobriety; in action it glowed with intelligence, good temper, and benevolence."

Those who knew him in later life can easily imagine him, in the buoyancy and strength of his youth, filling out this beautiful picture as a noble preacher of the word. One who gathered his facts from the utterance of the people says of his preaching: "The earnestness, the emotion that agitated his whole frame, the pathos as with tears he besought men to be reconciled to God, made his preaching memorable. No one questioned his sincerity; while the sound sense and strong speech of his discourse disarmed criticism."

It is interesting to notice the views with which Mr. Aiken entered the ministry. It was his opinion, formed in early life and held till his death, that the men who are called into the ministry will be led to their place of work. He never shared in the feeling of those who fear they may receive too little appreciation, and that they may not be led into a field suited to their ability. His counsel to his younger brethren was always that they should hold themselves in readiness for the largest labor, and then they should be willing to follow any call to Christ's work. When a youthful pastor had been dismissed from his people and knew not where to look for future labor, he received from him this advice in their tender parting interview. Laying his hand tenderly on his shoulder, he said, "I have but one thing more to say to you, my young brother, and that is *preach*," and then with peculiar emphasis, as his clear eye was dimmed with affection's tear, — "*preach*, my brother, whenever the Lord opens the way, for the Lord has need of you."

In the letter which he sent to the church at Amherst, accepting the pastorate, he expressed the thought as related to his own experience: —

“From the first it has been my purpose to labor in the Lord’s vineyard wheresoever in his providence he might plainly point me; and after a prayerful consideration of the subject of your invitation, believing as I do that an indication of duty is now given me, I hereby signify my acceptance; and relying upon the assistance of Almighty God, and moreover upon your Christian kindness and sympathy, I am ready to labor among you in the Gospel of Christ, according to the ability which God giveth.”

It was a part of his belief, which strengthened till his latest life, that the Christian minister may, with all confidence, commit his ways unto God. When, after years of labor, he was called to another church, where there was a wider field and a more attractive and in some sense more honorable position, the only question which seemed to agitate his mind was, where he might best serve the Church, and where Christ would bid him go. And when again called to his third pastorate we find him lovingly and obediently seeking only for the will of Christ. He *never* was a seeker after place. Modesty and humility were the beautiful graces of his character. This was the reason that he wore his honors so naturally and so gracefully, for they seemed to grow out of his character, just like those beautiful adornments of nature which are only a part of its life.

In beautiful harmony with his views as to the place where the Christian pastor should labor, we find his opinions relating to the pastoral office. His whole life rested firmly on this principle: that the minister of Christ must seek only to do the will of Christ. There is nothing new, nor is there anything peculiar in this, only as we find how perfectly his life was brought under the control of this belief. On the first Sabbath after his ordination he preached a sermon from this text, — *Now then we are ambassadors for Christ.* The words of this sermon bring us into close sympathy with the youthful pastor. Its opening sentence reveals the tenderness of his heart and devotion of his spirit as he takes up this great work.

“For the first time I speak to you as the beloved people of my charge, for whose souls I must give account. The responsibilities of this commission, therefore, I would have ever present to my own mind and to yours, and ever resting with equal weight upon our hearts, that this ministry of God may be unto us a savor of life unto life.”

As he opens the subject he speaks “not of him whom Christ likened to a wolf in sheep’s clothing; nor of him described by the prophet, as running when the Lord had not sent him, and declaring a message out of his own heart, and not from the mouth of God; nor of him who enters the ministry for selfish ends, making merchandise of souls. Such are not called of God, and God will not own them. But I speak of such an one as Paul; of him

who is honest, enlightened, and conscientious in the Master's service; of him whom God has qualified and called into it, and to whom, whether longer or shorter be the term of his service, love or hatred be the reward from his fellow-men, the great Master will say, '*Well done, good and faithful servant.*' Such an one is an ambassador for Christ."

In the progress of this first sermon he shows what is his duty as their minister: to receive the commission from Christ and faithfully perform it unto them; to remember those *instructions* always, and never exceed them; to do what Christ would do; to make no new terms between God and men, nor in any respect follow his own devices.

"He owes his first responsibility to his God, and even if the people perish, yet his own work is done, and the reward will be given to him. The main business of the preacher is to show with all argument and all learning how man may be reconciled unto God, and then by all persuasion and all sympathy to urge men to the acceptance of the conditions of God.

"As the first step, therefore, the preacher must set forth God's law in all its bearings upon man's character, conduct, and destiny. . . .

"He must make no account of the excuses which men make for refusing an immediate compliance. Do they plead that they derived their depraved nature from Adam, and are not responsible for it; that they have such hearts as God gave them; and that they feel such an aversion to the terms of the Gospel as they cannot overcome? The unaccommodating message is, '*Be ye reconciled to God.*' Do they plead they cannot change their own hearts, nor exercise repentance and faith; that to use the outward means and wait God's time is all that can be justly required of them? And yet the message returns, '*Be ye reconciled to God.*'

"He teaches them that the preaching of Jesus never recognizes any other inability than a wicked aversion to truth and duty. And as Jesus did not exhort sinners to use means and wait God's time, neither must the minister of Jesus.

"But lest the hearer be discouraged by this preaching of the law, he proceeds to declare what is the 'grand theme of his ministry,' the very centre of all the gospel, — '*Jesus Christ and him crucified.*' The preaching of the cross, and this alone, is the power of God for the reconciliation of man.

"He teaches that the truth in its *integrity* must be spoken, — nothing added, nothing softened, nothing omitted or reserved, — the whole truth to every one. Not a little of the character of the man is shown when he says, '*Simplicity is the proper ornament of religious truth.*' In this garb does it proceed from the lips of inspired men, yea, from the Master himself, and for the honor of the ministry in that garb only let it be dressed."

"Divest the gospel of its simplicity, and you have robbed it at once of its pride and glory. The pride of learning and talents, or perhaps the desire of popular applause, has in too many instances led to a style of preaching which has obscured the truth and defeated its design.

"Let such a professed preacher think of the words of Paul: '*If I yet pleased men I should not be the servant of Christ,*' or of the same Apostle's example in

preaching to the philosophic and cultivated Greeks at Corinth. It is indeed true that the pulpit calls for the best powers of the intellect as well as the heart.

"But if a man profane that place by essays on metaphysics, philosophy, and literature, let him not call it preaching Christ crucified."

These words show what was the idea of preaching which was in his mind when he entered the pulpit at Amherst. But there is one thing more which is necessary in order to the exhibition of the man in his work, and this is what he calls "great affection and tenderness"; there can be no exhibition of Christ which is true without that tenderness and that overflowing heart. His preaching must be, as he says, "like the preaching of Christ weeping over the sinners at Jerusalem; like that of Paul who ceased not to warn every man night and day with tears."

This was the standard which the youthful preacher gave to his people of what the preaching of Christ should be; and the most affectionate tribute to his memory is the tender mention, by those who listened to him from each of his pastorates, of his faithfulness and fidelity and tenderness in preaching Christ according to his own high standard. He never departed from these principles; but his life seemed to grow around them, and to all this plainness and fulness and "great affection and tenderness" he added, as inseparable from all true preaching, implicit reliance upon the Holy Ghost. This was the closing sentiment of that first sermon at Amherst:—

"Though he speak with ever so much *fulness, plainness, and affection*, yet without special divine influence accompanying the word, to convince, convert, and sanctify men through the truth, no saving fruits of his ministry will appear. But at the Lord's bidding let him prophesy in the valley of vision, and as he prophesies let him pray, '*Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live.*' This is the *first, last, and only resource*, and going forth in the spirit of reliance on God he shall not labor in vain."

It was true of him that his sermons were enforced by his life. As he went in and out before the people it was manifest that he was governed by the same principles which he enjoined on others. "The very high esteem in which he was held was not misplaced. He was a man of superior worth. Under a somewhat rough and angular exterior, there was a masculine and sagacious intellect. In his pulpit discourses he seized the strong points of the subject; the foundation and the framework discovered the granite and the oak and the wise adjustment of all the materials with which he wrought. My impression is that he used the cumulative style of discourse with very happy effect; taking, perhaps, a Scripture character as the groundwork of the delineation of some important Christian duty, he followed the truth so presented with a rapid and telling summary of exhaustive proofs which

swept on to the desired conclusion with an unction and force almost irresistible. He aimed at immediate results in his preaching, and so he gathered up and concentrated his argument on the single end which he wished to secure. Whatever might be said of his manner in the pulpit, there was no dissent as to his masterly treatment of the subject. And his success in winning souls showed that his word was with power and with the Holy Ghost and with much assurance."

The ministry of Dr. Aiken always gave evidence of his wisdom and success in all pastoral visitation and in all the care of his flock. The wants of his parish rested upon his heart, and it was a daily duty, which he never laid aside, to care for those committed to his charge. He was admirably fitted to do this pastoral work by the warmth of his own sympathy. There was in his look a soberness, which, in connection with his habitual dignity, sometimes impressed a stranger with the thought that his heart did not easily melt into sympathy with another. But after only a little acquaintance all this passed away, and the intercourse ever after would be full of proofs of the warmth of affection and brotherly regard. All his people learned to repose in his confidence and to depend on his never-failing sympathy. One who knew him well says of him:—

"His influence as a pastor was strengthened by the depth and tenderness of his religious sensibility. He was a man of strong faith, and tenderly alive to all that concerned the spiritual welfare of his people. Emulating the zeal and affection of the great Apostle, he was *gentle among them even as a nurse cherisheth her children*. He was at great pains to visit the sick and minister comfort to any who were in trouble. In all the various methods in which he made himself serviceable to his people, he was animated by a generous, self-sacrificing temper that awakened both gratitude and love. Having those qualities so suited to conciliate affection and confidence, we should anticipate that he would be greatly beloved by those whom he served in the ministry."

It was peculiarly noticeable that all his ministry was strictly impartial. The humblest among his people had all the sympathy of his heart. He was often at the homes of the poor; some of his most precious experiences were in the homes of those in humble life. There was an instance of his tender care which deserves to be recorded for its own sake, as it shows how the ministry of the gospel will reach those who are in great natural darkness, and to whom many avenues of communication are closed. There lived in his parish a young man who was deaf and dumb. He had been educated at the Hartford Asylum, and now, having learned to read and write with ease, and having acquired a taste for books and a knowledge of the language by signs, he had returned to the village of Amherst and followed the humble occupation of journeyman shoemaker.

In the year 1835 occurred the second general revival under Mr. Aiken's

ministry. The mother of this speechless young man was much exercised for him, and often asked others to join with her in prayer for her dear child. In an account which the pastor gives he says of the prayer of this mother, "Faith, humility, and desire had now reached that point when prayer has power with God. A friend communicated to John the fact that God's people were unitedly praying for the salvation of his soul. That intelligence was the means of his awakening. From that hour he became the subject of deep and pungent conviction of sin. Those who worked in the same shop witnessed the anguish of his spirit, but no man could give him relief. I visited him for religious conversation. John always kept a slate and pencil by his side, and by means of this a dialogue passed between us.

"Well, John, I have come on purpose to see you and converse with you about your soul. How do you feel in your mind?"

"Quite unhappy, sir. I feel that I am a great sinner against God. I am altogether a rebel. I am so miserable that I can hardly work."

"Your duty then, John, is to repent of all your sins and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ for salvation. Jesus Christ came into the world to save such as are lost. He can save the deaf and dumb as well as others. He is an all-powerful and gracious Saviour. "*Him that cometh to me,*" he says, "*I will in no wise cast out. My son, give me thine heart.*" Those words, John, he now speaks to you. Will you not at once give yourself up, and from this time obey and follow Christ?"

"I must not be in haste; I want to go sure. I must read the Bible; I must pray and be careful; it will do no good to be in haste."

"Surely," thought I, "the deaf and dumb are like other sinners." I sought to convince him that he must be in haste, in great haste; that it was Satan and his own wicked heart that would persuade him that there would be a better opportunity, while God says '*Behold now is the accepted time, behold now is the day of salvation*'; that he must obey the voice of God or lose his soul, and that the present time was a solemn crisis with him.

"With a heart raised to God in prayer I took leave of him. I could not but feel that the Eternal Spirit, who had manifestly begun his enlightening work in this sinner's mind, would carry it forward to conversion. Not long after John put in my hand the following note:—

"I feel happy beyond all my expectations, for I feel that relief came upon me, and that my sins are forgiven. I feel that God is merciful to me, and that there is hope in Christ. I must pray to God often for strength, for I am a poor weak sinner, and without his help I could not do right."

"It was evident there was a great change in John. His countenance wore a new appearance. Its gloom had passed away, and he was cheerful

and happy. He had new thoughts and new desires. His chief solicitude was for those still in their sins."

In his interviews with him the pastor drew from him these expressions: "I feel that I have a hope in Christ, as he is infinitely precious and lovely. I must be very thankful for his voluntary willingness to lay down his life in order to save thoughtless and miserable sinners. I do not complain of being deprived of hearing and speech, for God is very good and wise. Perhaps I might never have been a convert if I had not been deaf and dumb. Those who are deaf and dumb can think and feel, and they shall speak and hear up in heaven if they are good and pious. How beautifully innocent birds sing and praise God, as if they had souls! Woe to the wicked who refuse to do like the little birds, though they have souls."

Many of the young men of John's age were rejoicing in hope, and were taking active part in religious duty. John attended all the services and wished in every way to acknowledge God. He wished to take every cross. The sight of his companions leading in prayer deeply affected him. He longed to take up this duty, and his pastor encouraged him to write down his petitions and he would read them. Before the next meeting his prayer was ready, and during a momentary pause the pastor rose and read devoutly the humble petitions of this mute young man while he stood with bended head and clasped hands, and the whole assembly bowed, uniting in the prayer. These are the words of the prayer:—

"O merciful and holy God! I am a weak and miserable sinner. I have often gone beyond the commandments. I have long been a thoughtless and obstinate sinner. O Lord, soften my hard heart to fear and honor thee. I have long lived without thee. Make me perfectly willing and resolved to lead a better life. . . . O excellent Creator! receive me as a prodigal son. Calm my troubled mind and incline my heart to walk in truth and love and all thy ways. . . . I beseech thee to bring my speechless companions abroad to repentance; and to bless and comfort a miserable, speechless man who is now in State's prison. Thou art very good to send good men abroad to preach the gospel. . . . Let me feel for those who suffer. Remember all I pray for. O holy Lord! help me to do right to-morrow, if I live. I wish all happy. Don't let me cease to pray. Enable me to avoid temptations."

From this time he became very active as a worker for Christ. Under the direction of his pastor he visited from house to house, with his slate, talking with the people and persuading them to love Christ. He wrote to his pastor, "I often feel so full of love that I burst out in tears of joy."

Dr. Aiken often referred to him as a model worker in a revival. He became especially interested in two of his friends who were both speechless. Often in the language of signs would he urge upon them the claims



of Christ, and when after long labor and much prayer he had the sweet satisfaction of seeing them led to the Lamb of God, it was an inexpressible joy to see him returning "bringing his sheaves with him."

It was a peculiar joy to Dr. Aiken to be able to remember the service which he had rendered to this "speechless" young man, and when, more than thirty years after, the pastor returned to look for the last time on the scene of his first labor, the remembrance of this one conversion among the many awakened a peculiar tenderness. Weary with the heavy labor of life and already enfeebled by infirmity, he had again preached to the people of his early love. The greetings had all passed and the pastor and flock were about to separate, when the attention was called to one who had been patiently waiting and now with his own language of signs was uttering his cordial greeting. It was poor "speechless" John, and as they met for the last time they both wept, and many hearts were touched, and many who were strangers could but weep, to see the meeting of that dear pastor and his loving son in Christ.

This narrative is given in part to show what use was made in his ministry of the members of the church in Christian work. The responsibility rested on the church to carry forward the work of Christ, and it was one great object of his life to lead them to feel this. He often suggested special days of prayer, and sometimes the church by his advice appointed committees to visit every member; sometimes the neighboring ministers were invited in "three days' meetings" and at special services; but whatever the means employed, the end to be reached was ever the same Christian activity and personal zeal for Christ. About the beginning of his second year in the ministry the church set apart a day for special prayer. Soon after committees were appointed to visit every member of the church, and the reports were highly gratifying. "The committees had looked forward to their duties with great fear and trembling." But when they visited their brethren and sisters they found great satisfaction. Thus the work began; hearts were moved tenderly; confessions were made; the pastor moved easily among his quickened people, and the Holy Ghost descended upon the great congregations, and multitudes of sinners were found pressing into the kingdom of God.

This was the first revival during his ministry. As the fruits of it, sixty persons were received to the church. Another revival of still greater power was enjoyed during the year 1835. In the early part of the year the church appointed a "protracted meeting to continue as the providence of God may direct." The meeting continued eight days; the slumbering energies of the church were aroused; Christian life became again humble, penitent, and loving, and the Spirit of God came upon them with great power.

"Prayer-meetings were held in the homes of the people before each service, and the spirit of prayer and supplication was poured out upon the people. Sinners in great numbers were anxiously inquiring what they should do to be saved, and by the close of the meeting many were rejoicing in hope. An interesting feature of this revival was, that it particularly affected the young men. Many parents and heads of families were brought to give themselves to God, and all this is a proof of the boundless grace of God to Zion. *To Him be the everlasting praise.*"

These are the words of the pastor, and they reveal the personal trait of modesty and humility. He speaks of no effort of his own, but all the people were testifying to the wonderful power of his personal efforts in preaching and exhorting and in labors from house to house. As the immediate fruit of this revival more than one hundred persons were added to the church. We now approach the close of this first pastorate. Two hundred and twenty had been added to the church, and "his ministry of eight years had answered in all respects to its promise at the beginning. It gave him name and honor not only at home, but throughout and beyond the State."

During the latter part of the year 1836 the Park Street Church in Boston, having heard of the great success of his ministry, invited him to preach for them, and the result was that they gave him a call to become their pastor. This was sad news to the people of Amherst. But when their pastor stated his convictions, and the reasons which influenced him to believe it would be his duty to accept the call, they yielded gracefully to his judgment, and a council was called for his dismissal; and thus closed the first pastorate among the people of his early love, — a people who shared alike his latest affection, and who still pay the beautiful tribute to his memory as they speak of him as "our beloved pastor."

He was installed over the Park Street Church in Boston March 22, 1837. In this new field of labor he assumed at once a more public relation to the general interests of the church. To the duties of his parish were added those other cares which the church lays upon its wisest men. He became a member of the Prudential Committee of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and one of its corporate members. One afternoon each week was devoted to the committee. Another afternoon weekly was given to the Committee of Publication of the Massachusetts Sabbath School Society, of which he was a member; and all the causes of benevolence laid claim to his time, which was freely given. His pastoral labor was much enlarged, but it was not neglected. He called once each year on every member of his church, not neglecting those who were poor, "remembering even those who were domestics in aristocratic families," and in all these visits directing his conversation largely to the spiritual wants of those whom he visited.

The year 1840 was a season of revival in the church, and large numbers were added to its membership. During this year the discussion was going on in Boston as elsewhere in regard to special measures for the advancement of the cause of Christ. The question assumed such form in that city that it must needs have some definite reply. It had come to the knowledge of the people that the labors of Dr. Kirk as an evangelist were greatly blessed in other cities, and the desire was expressed that he be invited to Boston. There was a man who listened with peculiar delight to Dr. Aiken's preaching, because it was "peculiarly adapted to his own wants, scriptural, instructive, and practical." But this good man, whose praise is in all the churches, believed that the cause of Christ called for the labors of an evangelist in addition to the work of the pastors. He desired to invite Dr. Kirk to Boston, and yet he would not do it without the full consent of his pastor. There had been some degree of reluctance at least, on the part of other pastors, to act in this matter. But Dr. Aiken took the bold, decided stand, even against the judgment of some whom he loved, and invited Dr. Kirk to preach for him in a series of continuous services.

The immediate result of all this was that the Park Street Church was greatly and constantly revived and blessed; the pastor's heart was greatly encouraged, and the fellowship with such men as Safford and Hubbard and Dana and Homer and Homes and Dwight, who have gone to their reward, and with others still living, was sweet and heavenly; and one of the ultimate results was that Dr. Kirk was permanently retained in Boston. The relation of these two brethren was so intimate and genial that it will not be amiss to give the words of Dr. Kirk in estimate of his friend who has passed on before him: "Dr. Aiken was a man of great integrity of purpose, a high sense of ministerial responsibility, of great candor and charitable disposition, very regardful of others' rights, of more than ordinary humility. He was a man of solid acquirements, of firm principle, of thorough devotedness to the cause of Christ, of great simplicity. I never knew him to make an injurious or unkind remark."

During the connection with the Park Street Church more than four hundred were added to its membership. They experienced frequent refreshings from God. But when the increasing labors of that heavy pastorate had been borne for eleven years, the strong man who had "never known fatigue" before began to bow beneath the burden. The kindness of the church suggested a colleague to share the pastorate with him, and an effort was made to secure one; but failing in this, the weary pastor cheerfully laid down the duties which he had at the first so cheerfully taken up and which he had so nobly and so manfully borne. The council which met to dissolve the ties that bound him left this tribute of love and esteem:—

"He is exceedingly dear to all of us as a man, a Christian, and a minister of Christ. His uniformly consistent example, his simple-hearted and earnest devotedness to his work and to every good object, his valuable counsel and advice in our religious affairs, have given him a high place in the respect and affection of this whole community."

The ministry of Dr. Aiken in Boston suggests one marked characteristic, and that is his *soundness of judgment*. And to this was added a *firmness* in the right that could not change. It was noticed in early life, and it appeared more and more as he gathered wisdom with increasing years, that God had given him the power of a discriminating mind. This was early shown in his wise management as a pastor. "He was eminently discreet and judicious. He made no enemies; he avoided worldly entanglements; he entered into the sympathies of all classes; he brought his judgment to act advisedly in difficult cases. For this reason his counsels were widely sought." In the management of cases of discipline his *sound judgment*, united with prudence and his own kindness, always led to a happy result. He had a firmness which could not be shaken, for it was based on principle which cannot change. But until his mind was resolved, he was as docile as the heart of a child. Every man's case was safe in his hands, if it would bear inspection; but his reproof of wickedness was so positive, and so kind withal, that none but a hardened offender could abide it. A case of discipline occurred during his pastorate in Boston which showed his spirit and his firmness. It was an extreme case, and the accused party sought in a private interview first to coax and then to flatter and finally to intimidate him. He left the pastor's study gesticulating with his doubled fist and saying, "*If you dare, Mr. Aiken!*"

But he might as easily have shaken the oak from its foundation as to move him from his purpose when he knew he was right. There was something awful in his reproofs, for the offender knew that it was given after every palliating circumstance had been weighed in his favor, and in vain. There was a wonderful power in the question as he put it to the offender, — *Is this right?*

It has been already said that his counsel was widely sought. The churches reposed their confidence in his decisions, and in all the deliberations of benevolent societies his aid was invaluable. He was elected a trustee of Dartmouth College soon after he went to Boston, and held that office many years. One who knew well his worth speaks of him in that relation: —

"Here his commanding qualities found scope and exercise, and gave him special influence and distinction. His classical and professional learning, his experience as a teacher and disciplinarian, his large acquaintance, mature judgment, and unflinching integrity, made him prominent as an adviser, legislator,

and guardian of the college. He comprehended its exalted sphere, its sterling interests, its difficulties and dangers, and the policy by which alone it could answer its design. He was ever intent to keep it true to its foundation, above the dictation of sect or party, coterie or clique, a common benefactor, agreeably to its chartered rights and obligations, and responsible ultimately to God. He was a tower of strength in times of trial, always in his place, quick of discernment, patient in investigation, firm in purpose, and steady in performance. He was above all flattery and subserviency, incapable of acting for fear or favor, abhorrent of finesse and intrigue, and ever severe in honesty. Yet he was loving, kind, and genial. In the occasional snatches of relaxation necessary to all Boards in their long sessions and difficult discussions, he was quick to refresh himself and his associates with his generous humor and sometimes irrepressible hilarity. Then his glowing countenance, lively gesture, and ringing laugh were beautifully significant of the purity and integrity of his heart. If at any time his love of right or propriety led him to reprove too sharply a real or supposed wrong, he would frankly apologize for his fault of manner, still calmly erect and determined in independent virtue."

It is not strange that such a man was much missed from the deliberations of the metropolis of New England, when he turned his steps toward a new home among the mountains.

The church at Rutland, Vt., were happy in forming his acquaintance soon after he left Park Street, and, in answer to their invitation, he became their pastor, being installed March 29, 1849. The railroad had not then reached Rutland, and the town was only beginning to feel the pulse of that new life which, during his pastorate, was to transform and rebuild it. It was fortunate for the church that at this time it should have for its pastor a man of such liberal views and of such commanding influence. His ministry opened hopefully. During the next year after his settlement there were some indications of the Spirit's presence. Again, in 1856, there was a gentle refreshing. The year 1858 was a year of great interest to the churches throughout the land, and the church at Rutland shared largely in the general blessing. "Indications appeared in the autumn previous which were encouraging. A young people's prayer-meeting had been conducted by the younger members. This meeting was crowded, and for this reason removed to the chapel, and was held every evening for several months." The pastor was untiring, crowds of inquirers flocked to the meetings, and a spirit of prayer pervaded the whole town. A young man entered one of the meetings careless and sceptical. But he was so moved by the Spirit to pray and sing that he was led to wonder at himself. Going to a neighboring town on the morrow he sought out the pastor's study, and begged to know what he *should do to be saved*.<sup>1</sup> Such displays of grace were fre-

<sup>1</sup> A few days after, when he had found peace, he received a letter from his mother, residing in Connecticut, beginning with these words: "My dear George, your sister and I have set apart this evening to pray for you"; and that was the same night that he attended the meeting in Rutland.

quent in those meetings. So far as human instruments were distinguished, all the people knew that the pastor was the most efficient, and yet some of us remember to have heard him tell the story of that revival at the General Convention; and such was his modesty and humility that no one would have supposed that he was the honored instrument in the hand of God. In this as in all things it was the sentiment of his heart,—“To God be all the praise.”

One of the fruits of this revival was the development of the *lay element* as a working force. Meetings were held in remote districts; Sabbath schools were organized, and a system of *lay effort* inaugurated, which led to the most important results.

The additions to the church from this revival were eighty-five, and the whole number added during his three pastorates was eight hundred and ninety. The congregation had now outgrown their house of worship, and steps were taken to rebuild in a more favorable location. And the new church edifice, one of the most tasteful and beautiful in the State, was another fruit of that revival and a thank-offering of the people.

We come now to that sad transition which comes in human life when the strong man first yields full confession to the fact that the infirmities of life are very near. Dr. Aiken had been sensible for some time of failing health, and when the new church should be completed he had proposed to resign the office of pastor. But the people would not listen to this proposal, but suggested a colleague to share the labor with him. The result was the call of Mr. Norman Seaver, then a student in Andover, as junior pastor. Mr. Seaver was the man of his own choice, and he gave him all his heart. It was touching to hear him speak of him, for he seemed to feel towards him something very much like a father's tenderness and a father's pride. He longed to have the people love him, and he had the satisfaction of witnessing their sincere attachment to him. After three years he felt constrained by increasing infirmity to retire from the pastorate altogether, but he still retained the same affectionate interest in his youthful colleague, and it was the saddest duty of his life when he met for the last time in council with his brethren to give reluctant consent that the ties should be sundered, that Dr. Seaver might respond to a call to a wider field of labor. And now that we come to the close of the active ministry, it is fitting that we use the words of one who knew and loved him well:—

“Dr. Aiken was one of the best remaining specimens of the old-fashioned, healthful, and conservative virtue of New England. He was wise in advance of his generation, studious of principles rather than of expedients, of tendencies rather than accidents, of laws and their natural issues rather than speculative conceits and possibilities: a true man, and one of God's rare paradoxes,—strongest in weakness, richest in poverty, brightest in obscurity, and most eloquent in the silence of the grave.”

We have now followed our friend through three pastorates, and have seen him gain an honored name in three States. From the University of the last State in which he served the Church he received the degree of Doctor of Divinity. It only remains to speak a few words of him in his social relations, and then follow him in his rapid decline.

It will be inferred that he was specially genial in his companionships. He trusted his friends with his whole heart. There was no suspicion in his nature; and no one could come near him without being impressed with the guilelessness of his heart. It has been said of him, "He had the art of conferring a favor while he made you feel that he was the favored party." In his intercourse with his ministerial brethren he made no show of superior wisdom and claimed no precedence. "He had an unusual depth of social feeling and sympathy which would be developed on full acquaintance, a genial temperament, a nice appreciation of humor, and an intimate knowledge of men and things, which together made him an exceedingly interesting companion and a friend, such as in a lifetime no one would ever again expect to find."

He had a peculiar love for the youthful ministry, and, as has been well said, "He was one of those paternal spirits in whose society young ministers like to sit and drink in wisdom and love." One of the younger ministers who was settled near him remembers well how, when the ordination service was over and the ministers were taking their leave, he put his arms around the youthful pastor and drew him to himself saying, with his own surpassing tenderness, "Dear brother, you must have help whenever you need it, and all the help you need." And this was the spirit of the man; he gave to his younger brethren all the tender love of his heart.

If it were fitting to cross the sacred threshold of home and utter its sweet privacies, we should only tell how this same gentle heart entered into all domestic joy; to him his home was the dearest of all life's felicities.

Dr. Aiken was twice married; first to Miss Mary Osgood, of Salem, Mass. She was a niece of Professor R. D. Mussey, M. D., LL. D., then of Dartmouth College. He was married the second time to Miss Sophia W. Parsons, daughter of Rev. David Parsons, of Amherst, N. H., and a niece of Chief Justice Williams, of Connecticut; she survives him. His children are four,—one son, Edward, a physician in Amherst, N. H., and three daughters residing in Rutland. One son died in Boston at an early age.

During the following years, up to 1868, he preached frequently to neighboring churches, and was much engaged in the care of the public schools of Rutland. From the first he had taken great interest in the cause of education. One of the first votes which appears on the records of the church at Amherst after his settlement was "to make a subscription for five years to Dartmouth College." He was especially interested in the system of public education, and the people of Rutland owe him a debt



of gratitude, which they lovingly acknowledge, for the influence which he exerted for the cause of education among them.

In the pleasant month of June, 1868, he preached for the last time to the "beloved people" at Amherst. I cannot say whether there was a fearfulness that he might not long continue which led them to write many letters to their old pastor urging him to visit them and once more preach to them. The visit was made, and he preached his last sermons there. The parting interview was tender, and there was certainly a fearful apprehension then which led them to weep "most of all that they should see his face no more."

During the summer heat of that same year he was gathering hay, as was his wont, and he was affected with something like sun-stroke. And as he sat under the grateful shade of an elm-tree he sank almost into death. But he rallied, and in a few days seemed again quite like himself. His youthful colleague, Dr. Seaver, was much with him, and showed him the affection of a son. In the vain hope of benefit from change of air he bore him company for a few days to their chosen resting-place at Fort Cassin on the lake. For a time all seemed well, and he returned to that favorite resort with his wife. The fresh breeze of the lake always suited him, and his youthful spirits came back as he engaged again in his old-time sport.

But with all this hope there was still the deeper conviction in all our hearts that he was not long to stay with us. There was a heavenly beauty in his temper and spirit which made us feel that he was drawing near the better home. At the communion season in September he was too feeble to assist at the table, but he joined with great devotion in the services. It was his last communion with God's people on earth; and when they sang the last hymn he joined with his whole heart, especially in the last stanza:—

" Soon shall close thine earthly mission,  
Soon shall pass thy pilgrim days;  
Hope shall change to glad fruition,  
Faith to sight and prayer to praise."

He sung as if his clear eye was already beholding the joyful change, and those who loved him were so affected that they could not join the song.

He was able to attend church only a few times after this, but his Sabbaths were very precious. He would sit with his large-print New Testament and Psalms on his knee, or his Bloomfield's Greek Testament, which was his constant companion. One day he said, "One verse in Revelation on the New Jerusalem has been food for me all day." It was evident that his heart was communing with its God. During the last few weeks his friends knew, from the fearful symptoms about the heart, that he might drop away at any time, and so they could not leave him alone. It was a very tender grief in his heart when he expressed his sorrow that he could not be alone in secret prayer.

The days were now drawing nearer when the end must come, and he began to make every arrangement, like a wise man taking a journey. He wished to destroy old letters and all his sermons, but was persuaded to leave them for the comfort of his family. He seemed to wish more than ever to utter all his heart, and one Sabbath afternoon he had a long talk with his wife, and told her he should "never be well again." And then he uttered a secret which he had tenderly kept from them: "You look back to the sun-stroke, but the date is further back. I have never been well since my health broke down in Boston." In the evening, when they were all gathered "round the little stand," he said in an earnest tone, "If we really believe in the providence of God, why do we not act as though we believed? Not a sparrow falls to the ground without His notice. Sometimes when families are called suddenly to affliction they say, 'O that this or that had been different!' Now if we believe that God orders all events, then he ordered these things too. At such times people are apt to feel that this separation must always be borne, but this is not so. At the longest it will be but few years before they will all follow. Even the youngest will soon follow the oldest."

It was now the 22d day of February, and he had led the family devotions till this time, and he left the duty for the first time with reluctance. Much of the time the thought in his heart was of the mercy of God to him. "Many are sick away from home, and have strangers to care for them; but I have my family." He was tenderly alive to their loving caresses. When the physician called, not many days after, he said to him, "It is almost over. I have never been blinded by the encouraging symptoms you have shown me. The main difficulty has been steadily progressing."

He had for many years owned a beautiful horse, which was a great favorite, and, as a token of his love to his kind physician, he gave this noble animal to him.

Weary days followed, and sometimes they would soothe him by singing, and his voice would join in the favorite hymn, "How gentle God's commands," and then he would lift his hands and say, "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh my help." It seemed as though his heart was overflowing. He said he felt stronger when they held his hands, and he would often draw them to him and kiss them. There was great tenderness in his voice as he told them, "I shall soon leave you"; and, turning his eyes upward, he prayed long in secret, often repeating aloud "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." A heavenly light illumined the sadness of that home, for they almost beheld the form of angels coming near him; and on the 7th of April, with his family all about him, just as he wished it, he fell into a sweet slumber and awoke in heaven.

JOHN D. KINGSBURY.

BRADFORD, Mass.

## FIDELITY TO MINISTERIAL VOWS.

IN treating this subject, the point of departure obviously must be the meaning of the ministerial vow. On this subject it is not necessary to assume so high ground as to assert that there is contained in this vow an engagement to a lifelong occupation in the special work of preaching the gospel. Our interpretation must be guarded by not making too much of the likeness of the Christian ministry to the priestly function on the one hand or of the apostolic on the other. Certainly the ministers of Christ are priests, neither in the element of propitiation nor in that of special personal sacredness. Once a priest, always a priest, is a canon of ritual, only with a view to a typical significance. Nor shall we be allowed to infer that because the apostolic function was permanent in him who held it, the function of the preacher of the gospel is also permanent. The one was conferred in view of special preparation, to which, from the nature of the case, only a small number of men could be subjected. The ministry is but one of the several elements into which the Apostolate was disintegrated after its special work as personal witness of Christ had been performed, and is a function in the Church for which, when one who has discharged it for a time lays it down, others, in indefinite number, may be supposed to be in their turn prepared.

Feeling the need of disembarassing our conception of the Christian ministry of all sacerdotal and apostolic elements, the subject before us may be discussed on the ground of those who, arguing from the lack of Biblical evidence to the contrary, as well as from the nature of the case, affirm that the ministry of the gospel is not of necessity permanent in one who assumes its responsibilities.

This ground we must at least assume, that as he who enters the Christian ministry does it because he has been called by Christ, so he therein commits himself to continuance in its sacred function so long as he is not remanded to other offices in the Church by the same Supreme Head. If the Christian minister leave his work without Christ's order, he breaks his ministerial vow.

Without analyzing closely here the nature of a call to the gospel ministry, suffice it that we all recognize it as proceeding from the Head of the Church, and as being an authoritative and specific order from Him to the Christian who receives it. A military order over his signature from the commander of an army to his subordinate could not be more explicit, imperative. Hence attaches to it inexpressible sacredness. Being personally addressed and specific, and from such a source, as if the eye of

Christ were upon the person designated, and had his voice pronounced that person's name, one may well be awed at the thought of his having been so called to his work. The Apostle's words are justified, "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel." And during all the continuance of this office there is reason for the same sentiment in him as of one under direct divine commission, "Unloose thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." True, all Christian office is sacred. No church elder or deacon, no private member of the local church, in a right view of his relation, can fail to have a like feeling of awe. But most especially is there occasion for it in the minister of the gospel. Yet sacred as is the obligation of the Christian minister to enter and continue in his office in view of the call of Christ, should the Divine Will appear to point in the direction of its demission the obligation would, no doubt, be equally sacred to pass off into other pursuits. With all the members of Christ's army the *sacramentum* involves the duty to go here or go there, according to the orders of Him who is Captain of our salvation.

At this point, however, practical inquiries begin to press heavily upon those who are under the responsibilities of this office. Granting that the various functions of the church may be exchanged, and that the minister of the gospel may leave his ministry, it becomes a question what may be considered an intimation to a Christian minister, that the demission of his office is ordered by the Master. When may I suppose that I have an order to go from the ministry to secular pursuits? I say the question is one of awful moment to one who has either left the ministry or contemplates leaving it, for if he does this without his Lord's bidding, his ordination vow made to Christ is broken, and he and Christ are in controversy. Christ will sooner or later overtake him.

The questions to be asked with great earnestness are such as the following:—

1. Does entire failure of physical health warrant the exchange of the Christian ministry for a so-called secular pursuit? There are some who are able to avoid the difficulty by making a division of the forms of ministerial work; and affirming that some one of these forms is within the capability of every man whom Christ has suffered to be ordained. No doubt this avoids the difficulty, in perhaps the majority of cases, though we shall notice further this conception of different forms of ministerial work, on which the solution of the difficulty is founded. But it is hard to see how in this manner the difficulty in some cases is relieved. It may be said, for example, that the Lord will guard his servants from insanity, which would unfit them for any and every one of the many forms of ministerial work. But this is true, he does not, and the question must be met, even if the case be exceptional, whether permanent insanity does not therefore amount

to a recall of the function of the ordained minister. True, he retains that personal consideration which has just occasion, in the superior and more thoroughly intelligent Christian character that the ministry generally possess. But we should scarcely hesitate to say that if that mental aberration still left enough of reason only for the manual offices of life, to those its victim would be warranted in going by the loving Master, as his post of service.

2. We meet a second question, which obviously is more than a supposed case with many a minister of the gospel, and therefore should be turned over in full discussion. Should an extreme case of physical or intellectual want on the part of a minister's dependent family be interpreted as an order, remanding him from his ministry to a secular pursuit which will make possible the supply of that want? Grant that we may throw out of the consideration all ordinary cases of intellectual and physical privation, shall the question be answered by a universal negative? Shall we say that an ordained minister is not justified in leaving his ministry because his family lack bread, or the means of education? Shall we say that when that father undertook the preaching of the gospel, he undertook it with all which it involves for himself, enduring, if need be, the loss of all things, and that the family are in such federal relation with him, that as they share in a large measure in the spiritual privileges, trusts, and honors of the ministry, so they must be held answerable in its deprivations as well? Shall it be considered in further relief that Christ has a mysterious, and yet not seldom practised, way of supplying the apparently hopeless lack of his servants, and making the extremity to which their fidelity reduces and holds them his opportunity? Certainly the views suggested by these questions, which are not without much corroboration in Christian biography, are worthy of being seriously pondered. Is it said, as sometimes in reply, that charity begins in the minister's own home, and that his duty is not to the church at large before the church in his own household? The application of the principle must be guarded. What charity? That of caring for the physical or intellectual wants of his own household, before the moral and eternal wants of the world, or, rather, to put the matter in another form, whether the Christian minister's wisdom is not to trust, that, while he is furthering the Lord's work of saving souls, the charity which is needed at home in caring for the lower wants of those dear to him, will, to all essential extent, be exercised by the Lord through instruments of his own choosing. It is to be feared that the lives of as many ministers' families have been lost by saving them, as have been saved by losing them. No one, to say the least, is in a condition to answer the question, as a practical one, until fully possessed with the awful urgency of the ministerial work in calling on men immediately to repent.

3. A third question of practical detail would be this: Should failure in extreme degree of being appreciated as a minister of the gospel make him feel that the Lord bids him to other labors? All will agree that if the Master would not have him amid the vessels of the sanctuary he should retire. But does the fact that his ministry is not received with favor warrant leaving it?

I need not say that in answering both this question and the preceding, as well as others connected with the general subject, there is danger as well of falling into extreme views as of treating the subject with too much tenderness. We are not at all in a condition to answer it until we have had some real experience, or thorough observation of years in the ministry spent amid unsympathizing peoples, with whom our ministrations have been received with coldness, and between whom we have gone heavy-hearted, hither and thither, with a homeless family and an apparently unproductive ministerial life. A heartless and flippant casuistry on such a theme is out of place. Nor would it be easy for one to meet either of these last two questions with an unqualified yes or no. Our object is rather to call attention to this as one of the specific questions which cannot be neglected if we are to understand how much ministerial faithfulness involves. It may appear that many a man has in this matter too readily taken for granted his privilege of leaving the ministry, and that the vows of his early life are really broken. It does not altogether appear that because one fails to be appreciated, and fails signally to be appreciated, and is obliged often to change his field of labor, he does not in leaving the ministry flee from duty, and that at his peril.

Before such a step is taken, rather would it seem wiser to challenge one's purpose with such questions as these: Is not such failure to be appreciated due rather to a want of prayer in myself? or is it not due to a want, on my part, of prayerful study of the Bible? or is it not due to a lack in me of Christian yearning over the spiritual interests of my people? or is it not due to absorbing secular side pursuits, in which I am engaged? or is it not due to some lurking literary ambitions or affectations to which I am giving way? And, given wholly to the ministry, according to the minister's vow, would my ministry be unappreciated? And, after all, may it not be duty to continue in the ministry even if without appreciation? May not my burdened words be the means of a delayed harvest? May not the witness of my holy steadfastness preach later on, when its burden has been laid off for the rest of heaven? May not my ministry have its place as a ministry of judgment, if not as a ministry of blessing? May not, in fine, the Lord have a sovereign secret in my ministry, so that it is my duty to work on, though I scarcely know why, simply out of the holy instinct of a love of souls? In a word, must sight be called in as

final umpire to authenticate a ministry and its continuance, in a dispensation so much of faith as the Christian? One thing is certain, it is a serious thing to break an ordination vow, and in cases of so much doubtfulness, we had better question long and distrust our lower impulses than take the step hastily.

We cannot mention further in detail the forms which, in a truly Christian mind, the question of ministerial faithfulness will assume. Far be it from us to suppose that such a mind will ever think of leaving the ministry at the call of ambition or personal ease, or restlessness and desire of change, or a hankering after the comforts, the luxuries, the elegances of life. No man, morally sane, will ask such a question. If, as is to be feared is sometimes the case, this is done, the man has reason to decide between two fearful alternatives; either he has fallen under the power of some awful temptation, or he has been called neither into the Christian ministry nor into the kingdom of Christ, and in either case should look well to his hope of heaven.

What has been said will be enough to show that if the ministers of the gospel mean to be faithful to their vows, not a few things are to be carefully challenged, to which all are liable. The question, what is involved of endurance and suffering in ministerial fidelity, comes to appear one of great breadth and comprehensiveness.

Let us now speak of the importance of the question. There are some questions in the administration of the church which can be postponed by the church at large and by the individual Christian. But what we mean to affirm now, is the vital importance of more careful inquiry upon this subject. Again and again would we affirm that the claims of fidelity to ordination vows should be more earnestly and prayerfully considered by the Christian ministry. This appears from many particular considerations.

1. The thing that naturally occurs first is the intrinsic guilt of abandoning a calling personally assigned by the Head of the Church and formally accepted with the solemnities of ordination in the presence of the church. Not merely must the minister of the gospel be affected by the momentousness of the function he has the responsibility of, but he must feel that the call to it was a personal call to him. It was from the Head of the church. It was accepted voluntarily, and the vow was made to be true and faithful in its performance. In fact, the obligation which holds an ordained minister of the gospel in his place is apparently the profoundest this world knows, and to leave that place is exceeded by nothing as a development of moral infidelity. The inference is plain; no Christian minister should leave his office without manifest discharge by the Master, while even then it might be supposed he would go with tears as one goes to wander in strange and uncongenial climes, away from home and privi-



lege. He who contemplates leaving the ministry has need to question whether he is not on the threshold of a great apostasy. The sinfulness involved in it is so great, that the importance of prayerful, personal inquiry becomes manifest. The inquiry, What will ministerial faithfulness allow a Christian minister to do? is one of the first in magnitude for the Christian and the minister to consider.

2. The frequency with which we see the ministry of the gospel abandoned, and the great temptations persuading to it, are reasons why the church should have determined principles as to what only will make it right. We must not be too hasty in comparing the present with the past. The present is so much nearer than the past that the true perspective is lost. We need not do it here. Nor will we be uncharitable. The statistics are not at hand which can be used to any certain conclusion. We all know some who have left the ministry, and others who are in danger of leaving it, without warrant from the Master. We will not be censorious critics of our brethren. But that the church has the burden of many of its under shepherds leaving their pastoral office, to which it has ordained them at the command of Christ, is a fact most lamentable. In no small numbers, Christian ministers are tending to leave their ministry for occupations of no questionable incompatibility with their sacred vows. I speak not now of occupations which some will claim to be a part of ministerial work, but of those which are severed entirely from it. Nor are the temptations few or weak which will aggravate this great evil unless strongly withstood. And it is time for those who guard the office of the ministry, and for the church, to raise aloud the inquiry, what fidelity to ministerial vows implies; high time to challenge this easy and not infrequent exodus.

It is said, for extenuation of the evil, that the office is thus rescued from the occupancy of many who are a hindrance to its function. Not unfrequently men leave the ministry who have not been without the seal of Christ on their labors. As to others, grant that it may be wiser in them to leave their sacred calling than to be a hindrance and a scandal in it. But the resources of divine grace do not leave the minister of the gospel to any such alternative. Rather should he avail himself, seeing that he is, under vows of that grace, to be a man the richness of whose ministry, in its character and fruits, shall realize the ideal of the gospel and the example of the Master. No minister of the gospel need leave the ministry for the ministry's good, any more than a poor sinner need stay out of the kingdom of Christ for that kingdom's good. Rather should he drink so deeply and draw so on the divine furnishing, as to be a shepherd whose flock shall recognize in his the Master's voice, and be led into all truth. Indeed, we cannot conceive it possible that, under ordinary circumstances, any one need be an ineffective minister of the gospel.

3. But let us consider, in the third place, the consequences of unwarranted abandonment of the ministry. All can judge whether painful facts do not make the suggestions offered more than theory. One of these consequences is its effect in modifying prevailing views of the ministerial character. What we mean is, that the ministry, as regards the sacredness of its calling, the imperativeness of its function, the degree of its actual piety, and its consequent claims to general consideration, is disparaged greatly in the estimate of men by this facility with which its work is left. The line of the prevailing influence is as determined as the course of the sun. What can be left so easily can neither be most sacred, most important, most loved. And any man who leaves the ministry, save with most manifest justification, can hardly hope not to be tributary to such sinister influence. The mass of men do not take account of peculiar circumstances. It is most reasonable to expect that, should a broad and easy way be allowed to remain open from the ministry to other pursuits, there can be no hope of a trusted and revered ministry. The honor of men is for those ministers of religion who are steadfast at their self-denying post, endure hardness as good soldiers, and count not their lives dear unto them. We can no longer avoid raising the question which presses upon us especially here, what it is to leave the ministry. Going how far, in what direction, does the Christian minister leave his work? The analysis will lead our minds along through such details of questioning as these. We do not speak of joining with the ministerial function some other work which will be ancillary to it, as with Paul was his making of tents. But does one leave the ministerial work when he takes the office of instructor in a theological seminary? Does he leave it when he becomes a teacher in the earlier stages of education in a Christian college? How when he becomes the editor of a Christian newspaper? When he takes a situation as actuary of a Christian benevolent society? When he enters the teacher's desk in a Christian academy? When he is only treasurer in one of these institutions? When he makes the money which sustains them and for the purpose of sustaining them? Makes the brick out of which their edifices are built? or becomes the man who puts up the walls of their buildings, the carpenter and painter and tapester who finishes and enriches their interior? The agent of the company who insures the consummated structure from fire? These questions suggest to one who is disposed to think closely a matter of serious uncertainty, and a perilous avenue through which to fall into desertion. And they lead us back to a query, which is to many minds a settled principle, and more than a query, — whether one who has the vows of the ministry on him is not obligated thereby, until well discharged from them, to be occupied as his work with the *personal preaching of the gospel*. Grant that the exigencies of the Christian work make

it right for him to devote some portion of his time and energy to these other matters ; grant that if there is no mason in the place to erect a sanctuary, it may be his duty to take up the trowel, and if there be no one to fill a chair of theology or philosophy, or of editorial labor, or of an actuary, he may do this work as supplementary, although involving a partial discharge from his ministerial work. But that, so far as not discharged from his ministerial vow which he judges of at great peril, his solemn obligation is to *preach the gospel*. His vow commits him to the *preaching of the gospel*, and unless good reasons appear for supposing himself discharged, by interests at stake which overbalance decidedly the interests sacrificed, his place is to *exhort men everywhere to repent*. Great are the temptations to err in this regard. It is to be feared that many of us make these extra ministerial offices a Joppa to which to flee from the peculiar hardships of a ministry in this age, so little permanent and so much subject to the caprice of an excessive and enormous individualism. Who that has had to do with young men does not know that many a young man studies theology and takes the vows of ordination, as a passport to a situation which shall be permanent in a Christian college. Our proposition is, that such easy abandonment of the labors of the Christian ministry, seen through by the insight of shrewd men, disparages the Christian ministry in their estimate, and renders them less open to its influence, making it our duty, therefore, to challenge all cases of proposed transfer from the active ministry, and to allow it in ecclesiastical counsel only when warranted by the plainest signs of Christ's approval. No one will deny that the ministry is strongly tempted ; so much the more imperative the obligation that they be under double guard, that the ministry be not blamed.

4. One other consequence of unwarranted abandonment of the ministry, which should make us more on our guard concerning it, is its effect on the deserting minister himself. It is a grand law in the whole organic universe, that what works truly in its function works healthily to itself. Accordingly, conversely, an unfaithful ministry is a ministry distorted in character, which soon becomes a reproach to itself. The aberration is great, and so the ruin is great. He who wrongly deserts his ministry, led by literary ambition or desire, either of permanent home or of personal independence, and a livelihood that is assured, is least to be trusted in the long run, and is most fearfully likely to fall under great temptation. There is scarcely any safety for such a man. The retributive law, which Christ permits also to range for purposes of discipline through his kingdom, will not let him alone. We will not give credit to wholesale charges ; but all must admit that the utter hazard to character of ministerial infidelity in this form is exemplified by not a few examples in the walks of secular life. While the minister of the gospel remains about his work, the Saviour keeps

him; but when he leaves it, the Saviour leaves him to his own heart, and he falls.

Many considerations, therefore, it will be seen, press upon us the duty of making the leaving of the ministerial work a more prominent subject of inquiry than it has hitherto been. But at this point we are reminded that we have taken but a narrow view of our subject, and there opens up before us a far broader and more imperative inquiry still, which yet must have much briefer treatment. We have spoken of abandonment of the ministry as if it were the only form of ministerial infidelity. But, alas for us! the vow we take in ordination engages us while in the ministry to be faithful in the fulfilment of the holy function. "But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, make full proof of thy ministry, give thyself wholly to these things." "I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears." Wherefore, I take you to record this day that I am pure from the blood of all men." While, therefore, we have been considering the sinfulness of the infidelity,—what only shall allow us to lay aside ministerial duty,—our convicted hearts admonish us of the guilt of infidelity, while still we continue in the service. Is not the sin the same in kind, and perhaps of equal magnitude? Are not its consequences on others and on ourselves as fearful? Than a ministry perfunctorily performed, and with a divided heart, what more flagrant violation of the ordination vows, what heavier mill-stone on the neck of a struggling church!

A little more closely viewed, as one looks abroad upon the condition of the church, with much no doubt to cheer, there is much also which burdens the heart. There are aspects of the work which we dwell upon with great sadness, as we talk with one another of the immediate prospects of the church. The most general fact of all, the one dwelt upon most frequently with a heavy heart, is the failure of the gospel to take hold of the hearts and consciences of men, the inefficiency of the preached word. Not only among the multitudes of our great cities, but in our rural districts, and among our most virtuous populations. Grant that the Christian ministry has done the most of what has been done for the welfare of men. We are forced to observe how slowly so much has been accomplished, and how much remains to be done, and how slow the progress which is making. In our vast centres of population why are conversions only here and there? The parish in which I have been working for so many years, why so few added to the sons of light? The nation, the leavening of its counsels with the principle of Christian allegiance, why so slow? This slow progress everywhere, this toilsome struggling of the church of Christ everywhere against the empire of death, why so slow, why so toilsome? Shall we leave the relief of the mystery to suggestions of the undoubted sovereignty of God? or to the inactivity of the servants of God?

Analyzing the state of the conflict still more closely, we observe in the estimate of the Christian ministry much which is calculated, at least, to awaken concern. We will not, perhaps, accept the judgment that the ministry has lost ground in the estimation of men. One thing will not be denied,—that there is not accorded to the minister that consideration which befits his mission, and compares with the relative regard which has environed and enthroned the ministers of other religions in the days of their ripeness and vigor. Abroad, the sanctuaries of religion are deserted. At home, the words of the minister make men neither weep nor tremble. Shall we say that the Christian ministry divide their influence now with other forces working to the same end, or that this is a material age?

Or, in another direction, painful observation is had of worldly principles, adopted in the administration of the church, no whit differing from the modes in which worldly men sustain and carry forward their enterprises, in forgetfulness of the supernatural character of the church and its having as its one organizing and vitalizing principle the Holy Ghost. Extravagant and obtrusive architecture, the opera of the orchestra, the fashion of the pew, the church tending to leave the choice of a ministry with the world, provided the salary can be paid. Pardon us, these are facts which do not any less sadden us, because they are not new in the history of the church, and perhaps we have explained them sufficiently in referring them to the low condition of piety in the flock, and to the age unsusceptible to the tremendous and eternal realities of the moral world.

And once more, approaching a narrower fact still, we observe what is on the lips of all of us, the multitudes of young men crowding to secular pursuits, and so few recognizing any call to the gospel ministry; the cause of Foreign Missions waiting in vain for men with which to reap the white fields of China, and along the Bosphorus and the Euxine. Why so many? Why so few? Perhaps it is enough to say that this is a material age, to which the moral world is impalpable, and eternity hidden by the interests of time,—an age epicurean instead of spiritual and congenial to Christianity. Perhaps the explanation is sufficient. But, to say the least, there is a profound conviction in many thoughtful and most respectable minds, that one among the causes which together explain these sad features of the church is the failure of ministers to realize the Scriptural ideal; and that the church has not an apostolic growth, because it has not an apostolic ministry. Let us not seem to speak as if the ministry of this age were on the whole inferior in ministerial quality to the ordinary ministry of the past. We institute no such comparison. But if the issues gathering out of all the past make the conflict weightier and more stupendous, is it not greater unfaithfulness than can be charged on the past, if we do not rise to a higher level of ministerial faithfulness than they. If our conflicts are greater, the

ideal of ministerial character is higher. With the privilege of being in these more ultimate struggles of the world, comes the demand that we clothe ourselves more mightily with the strength of God.

One thing is certain, the Christian ministry must lay its ear to the secrecies of its own heart and life, and, listening there prayerfully, say whether or not there is occasion to look further for an explanation, why the battle is wavering and trembling on the line between victory and defeat. Let the ministry, without resorting to comparisons with the past, make estimate how many within its ranks are dividing their hearts and wasting their energies in literary and scholastic ambitions. How many are withholding themselves from that mighty study of God's word in prayer, which is the only thing that can make a minister of the gospel mighty. How many are involved in social connections to which they are giving attendance on the caprices and prejudices of worldly minds, and are utterly incapacitated for being witnesses of God, as if the prophet Daniel had been present during the progress of Belshazzar's feast rather than at its close. How many, taking counsel of flesh and blood, and perceiving that, what is too true, — that men are prone to make the ministerial gospel a commodity of the market, to be obtained on demand at a carefully gauged tariff, and not *received* because sovereignly sent of God, — how many, I say, suit their wares to the superficial and immoral demands of the purchaser, that they may not suffer with their families by not obtaining a parish, or by losing it when once obtained. How many, in fact, make of their ministry a *profession* instead of a great and mighty burden of love upon their hearts. And how few of us, prayerfully considering *our ministry*, can say, "I take you to record this day that I am pure of the blood of all men."

Returning, then, to the practical aspect of our theme, the obligation to *fidelity*, according to the true *ideal* in the Christian ministry, is pressed upon us by all there would be of difference in the condition of the church, if we were such ministers as we *should be*. The ministry of Christ are under vast responsibilities in this age. Bound not only by ordination vows, but by fidelity to these vows, enforced by the fact that consequences of such magnitude depend on the manner in which we acquit ourselves as ministers of the everlasting gospel. Let us lay aside our ambitions, our flippancies, our undue conformities, our indolence, our elegances, our fear of man, and study of man, and going where Christ leads us, and because Christ leads us, overriding the tyranny which makes us go and come at its bidding, trusting in Christ to provide for us. Before such a ministry — the whole history of the Christian struggle proves it — no deadly materialism, no unsusceptibleness to spiritual things, would endure for a generation. Reinforced by the supernatural aid of God, itself supernatural, it would wake the latent moral susceptibilities of men as a slumbering army is

awakened by the clarions of heroic leaders, as the last trumpet will awaken the dead. To the faith that is mighty enough to die for Scotland, Scotland will be given.

This is obviously the point at which the movement is to begin in the Christian ministry. A personal review of their vows, and a renewal of them in the interpretation put upon them by the circumstances of this age, is the burden of this hour. So far as this is done, there will be little occasion to complain of a barren or unproductive ministry. The churches will be drawn to a higher level of spiritual apprehension and life, and will stand around their pastors as the old Guard of Waterloo. The ministry will be in honor and have power. No man will be without a place, and sooner or later no place will be without a man; for, when souls are kindled with this new spirit of apostolic onset and faith, the young men will have their quick eyes turned to them and their hearts will warm with holy ardor. They will begin to ask for the sword and the harness, and be eager to go out with such; for no mightily earnest ministry ever failed to have its ranks filled. Danger does not deter men, but the lack of a rallying-cry from men in the van, who, being in the mighty conflict, feel its greatness. There is no need of a cry even. The young will come when they see the spirit of the battle. Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit,—many of its own kind. America will be given to such a ministry. Such is the ministry that is to disciple all nations, for it was such a ministry that went out from under the baptism of the Pentecost.

JOSHUA J. BLAISDELL.

BELOIT, Wisconsin.

---

“O THAT our prelates would be as diligent to sow the corn of good doctrine as Satan is to sow cockle and darnel!” — HUGH LATIMER.

“It is an abominable shame, and a crying sin of this land, that poor people hear not in their churches the sum of what they should pray for, believe, and practice,—many mock-ministers having banished out of divine service the use of the Lord's Prayer, Creed, and Ten Commandments.” — THOMAS FULLER.



## LITIGATION AMONG CHURCH-MEMBERS.

CAN A CHRISTIAN CHURCH CONSISTENTLY ALLOW ITS MEMBERS TO "GO TO LAW"  
ONE WITH ANOTHER?

WE here use the term "go to law" in its ordinary sense of litigation or contention before the civil tribunals in regard to the settlement of ordinary business transactions. Nothing can be more evident than that in any case where other parties, perhaps yet unborn, may have the legal right to demand a legal decision, a legal decision should be had,—as, for instance, oftentimes in the settlement of estates, or where one is acting as agent, trustee, or guardian.

In seeking a reply to this question, we find that the churches profess to regard all unregenerate men as belonging to the kingdom of this world, and all regenerate men as belonging to the kingdom of Christ; and also that they profess to regard themselves as organizations belonging to the kingdom of Christ, whose membership should consist of such persons, and such only, as, by manifestly desiring and intending, to the best of their ability, to render true and hearty obedience to *all* the laws of Christ, evince that they themselves belong to his kingdom.

There is a very wide and characteristic difference between the citizens of these two kingdoms, and a like difference between the ideas from which the ethics or laws of the two are developed. A sense and love of justice is, and ever has been, *the* characteristic of human beings in all ages of the world. It is an essential attribute of natural unregenerate humanity; consequently the laws or ethics of all the nations of the kingdom of this world are, and ever have been, developed from the idea of justice.

If now we look to the true kingdom of Christ, we find it composed entirely and exclusively of such persons, and such only, as have experienced a great and radical change in the object of their strongest and predominant affections. They do not love justice less than before the change, but they love Christ and their fellow-men *more*. They have the same kind of self-sacrificing love to men that Christ himself had. "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Hence the ethics or laws of Christ's kingdom are developed, not from the idea of justice, but from the idea of Christ-like, self-sacrificing *love to men*. The latter necessarily *include* the former. "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor." "Love is the fulfilling of the Law." Love forbids one to do an injustice to another as absolutely as justice itself does. It commands one always and on all occasions to come up to the full demands of justice, and oftentimes to follow the example of Christ in going far beyond what justice requires. But the former excludes

the latter. Justice never requires one to perform acts of love and mercy. It knows nothing of them.

- We find also that whenever there arises a difference in judgment between men (and Christians like other men are liable to differ in judgment) in regard to what justice requires of each in any given case, then an alienation of the affections either has arisen in the heart of one or the other or both of the parties, or there is the most imminent danger that such alienation will sooner or later arise. The commands of Christ forbid such alienation as clearly, and as explicitly, and as imperatively, as they do injustice in regard to property.

It is plain, therefore, that if a reference of any matter is necessary, the laws of Christ demand that such reference be made to a tribunal so organized and constituted that it must, in its official capacity, recognize the parties as belonging to the *kingdom of Christ*, and as bound by the most sacred obligations to render obedience to *all* the laws thereof. And also that the person or persons acting as such tribunal be well and intimately acquainted with the principles and teachings of the Holy Scriptures, and disposed, in this particular, faithfully to execute them. An experimental knowledge of the love of Christ is certainly a very important, if not an absolutely essential, qualification for the proper performance of such office. "This is my commandment that ye love one another as *I have loved you*," — with an unceasing, unremitting, self-sacrificing love.

Of this command of Christ our civil courts not only take no cognizance, but they are almost always, if not uniformly, so conducted as to be directly calculated to increase alienation if it already exists, or to excite it if it does not exist. They never do anything toward removing or settling the alienation, which is very often at least, if not always, the most important part of the difficulty between the parties.

The civil tribunals in all nations, whether civilized or not, whether called Christian or heathen, as we have seen, are solely for the purpose of ascertaining what, in any given case, the principle or law of justice requires to be done. The idea of justice is the central and all-pervading idea in their organization, and in the rules by which their investigations *must* be carried on. They aim at, and from the very nature of the governments by which they are constituted can aim at, nothing higher or better. The command of Christ to love one another, and to maintain a state of good understanding one with another, is entirely ignored. It was evidently for this reason that the Apostle so pointedly condemned the Corinthians for going to law with each other. To suppose it was because the civil courts were so corrupt is to bring St. Paul down from his high office of *preaching the gospel* to the absurd position of looking out for the pecuniary interests of the disciples in that commercial city. Neither could it have been on ac-

count of any prejudice on the part of the judges against them as Christians, for any such prejudice would be equal against both the parties. They do not even in our own country, and, from the very nature of the case, they never can, rise to the position and dignity of Christian courts. They are at the very best only courts belonging to the kingdom of this world. They are not, therefore, such courts as the disciples of Christ can consistently resort to, or such as a Christian church can consistently allow its members to resort to, for the settlement of any disagreements that may arise between them. They publicly profess to belong to another kingdom, — a kingdom having a *perfect* code of laws, based upon and developed from another idea, — the idea of *self-sacrificing love to men*. How, then, can they allow one member to drag another before a tribunal of a kingdom whose laws are developed from the idea of strict justice, and from whose courts the Christian idea of *love to men* is entirely excluded? To do so would be placing themselves on a level in this respect with the men of this world. It would be permitting its members to take as their guide in their *business lives* the laws of the kingdom of this world, to the rejection of everything distinctive of the religion of Christ. It would be practically admitting that in regard to *business principles* there is no essential difference between Christianity and heathenism.

No civil government which should allow one of its citizens to arraign another before a court under another government could command or long retain the ardent patriotic love or even the confidence of its citizens, or the respect of other nations. Nor can the church which allows one of its members to arraign another member before the civil tribunals command or long retain the ardent Christian love of its members, or the respect of the community in which it is located. The Freemasons evidently understand this. There can be no doubt but that it is the *manifestation* of that fraternal spirit which prohibits the going to law with each other that so attaches so many men — some of whom are members of our churches — to their Brotherhood. But the case is stronger. Human civil governments are all based upon the same fundamental idea of justice, so that if one does take his fellow-citizen before a foreign court, he is still before a court of justice. But church-members profess to belong to Christ's kingdom, and to be amenable to its laws, which laws are developed from the idea of love to men.

May we not go still further, and hesitate to regard any organization which allows its members to take the laws of the kingdom of this world as their guide, to the rejection and exclusion from their business lives of everything that is distinctive of Christianity, a Christian Church? Are not all such organizations, even though they may be mainly or even wholly composed of regenerate men, evidently of the kingdom of this world, and not of the kingdom of Christ?

But our consideration of this subject would be very imperfect, without going on to state what we regard as the Scriptural teachings upon it. The inquiry arises, "What! shall a man's church-membership shield him from being compelled by the civil authorities, if need be, to do that which is just and equal?" We reply, "No, most certainly not!"

It is true, indeed, that Christ established no tribunals for such cases; nor did he give his churches any authority or directions for establishing any, much less for acting in that capacity as churches.

In this we see his intimate and perfect knowledge of human nature. He well knew that for his churches to attempt to do so would not unfrequently involve themselves in divisions and alienations. He well knew that all such established courts would, through the insidiousness of selfishness, be likely sooner or later to degenerate into places where the parties would go to *contend*, each for his own "rights," but where they might be much less likely to obtain them than if they went to the civil tribunals.

The fact that he gave no specific directions how his disciples should do, in order both to find out what is just, and also to find out how far the demands of strict justice should give way to the demands of Christian love, and thus maintain a state of good understanding and love in such cases, is no more strange than that he did not tell them precisely how to repent, or how to believe, or how to love; and affords no more or better excuse for the neglect or the failure of the parties to maintain a state of good understanding and love than the lack of specific directions how to repent, believe, and love does for the neglect of those duties.

He wisely left it to the wisdom and the consciences of the parties themselves to devise the way and the means. He well knew, and we all know, that if the parties were both guided by Christlike love one to another, they would in all minor cases come to an amicable adjustment by mutual concessions; and that in any case where they found themselves unable to do this, they would extemporize, so to speak, a court far better adapted to their peculiar wants and purposes than any regularly established court could be. They would call to their aid such person or persons, and such only, as they might judge best qualified and fitted, not only to ascertain what justice requires, but also to preserve, or restore and maintain in active exercise, a spirit of mutual respect, love, and good-will. He knew, and we all know, that if both the parties are really controlled by the spirit of Christ, this will be easily done. They will, if need be, "set those to judge who are least esteemed in the church, and cheerfully accept their award." But this will not be necessary. "Is it so that there is not a wise man among you who is able to judge between his brethren," unless he is sitting as a judge in a civil court? Will his wisdom forsake him the moment he leaves the judicial bench?

It is, then, clearly the duty of every Christian to seek such a reference in

all cases of serious disagreement in the settlement of his business transactions with any of his fellow-men, and especially with professing Christians. And is it not plain that it is the duty of the church to discipline any member who persists in refusing such a reference? Such refusal, and a deliberate and persistent choosing to carry any such case before a court organized under and in accordance with the laws of the kingdom of this world, instead of before one organized under and in accordance with the laws of the kingdom of Christ, is to be regarded as *prima facie* evidence that the chooser has not the spirit of Christ, and consequently has no right to a place in any organized Christian church. And he should be called to account; for he deliberately prefers to render obedience only to the laws of the kingdom of this world, rather than to all the laws of the kingdom of Christ. The obedient servant of Christ earnestly desires to correct any and all errors into which he may have fallen. A failure on the part of one accused of injustice to suitably manifest such earnest Christian desire is *always* a very serious offence,—an offence which no church can disregard without dishonoring one of the distinctive and most important laws of Christ's kingdom.

It is also an offence concerning which every member of the church may safely be regarded as competent to judge. At the time the accused was admitted to membership he was supposed to have the spirit of Christ. He is now charged with not manifesting it, and they are called upon to reconsider their former judgment.

The question at issue between the parties is another and an altogether different affair. It may be one concerning which very few, and possibly none, of the members of the church are *fully* competent to form an intelligent and trustworthy opinion.

Christian charity presumes it to have arisen from an honest and innocent error in judgment.

The question, Which of the parties has so erred? and to what extent? should be referred to such person or persons as the parties themselves regard as well qualified to judge. This should be done in the spirit of meekness and of mutual love, each exercising the most watchful care against going himself or of leading his brother into the way of temptation. If brought before the church at all, it should be only so far as may be needful to enable them to judge of the temper and the spirit of the accused.

It can require but very little reflection upon the precepts, the character, and the work of Christ, to convince one that He could never have designed that His church should sit in judgment upon such questions.

But to be still more definite. Does any Christian inquire, "What shall I do when I unhappily differ widely in judgment from some one who persistently refuses such a reference?" We reply, "If the refuser is not a mem-

ber of any church, and you judge the case to be of sufficient importance, you are evidently at liberty to appeal to the civil courts, or to resist his claim before the civil courts, even as the Apostle Paul appealed to the civil government for protection, and also when he said, 'Nay, verily, but let them come themselves and fetch us out.' If he is a member of some other church than the one to which you belong, it will, in ordinary circumstances, be your duty to inform such church or its officers of *the fact of such refusal*; then if the church takes no action in the case, or if from any cause it fails to act with sufficient promptness to prevent a wrong, — as, for instance in case of an attempt at fraud, embezzlement, or absconding, — you are evidently at liberty to meet him on his own ground, and to act toward him in the same manner as if he were not a member of any church. If the church exclude him, he may then be regarded and treated precisely as if he had never been a member. If he is a member of the same church with yourself, you are to regard his *refusal* to submit the case to some such Christian reference as above named as being such a violation of his covenant with you and with the church as to render it your duty to take notice of it by way of discipline, and in due time and in due form to bring *the fact of such refusal*, but not the matter in dispute, before the church. If this cannot be done with sufficient promptness to prevent a wrong, — such as fraud, embezzlement, or absconding, — or if the church is so remiss in duty as to neglect or refuse to hear you, or if he refuses to hear the church, "let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." Such we regard as being at least a proper course, if not the only course, you can *consistently* pursue. The church cannot allow such a one to remain a member without very *grave inconsistency*.

STEPHEN TRACY, M. D.

ANDOVER, Mass.

---

LAW was designed to keep a state in peace,  
To punish robbery, that wrong might cease;  
To be impregnable; a constant fort,  
To which the weak and injured might resort;  
But these perverted minds its force employ,  
Not to protect mankind, but to annoy;  
And long as ammunition can be found,  
Its lightning flashes and its thunders sound.

CRABBE.

## A DISCUSSION OF SUNDRY OBJECTIONS TO GEOLOGY.

No two persons view any subject in precisely the same light. There is always, to some extent, a difference in their ways of observing facts, a difference in the degrees of shading or of illumination under which every topic presents itself to their minds, and consequently a difference at once in their generalizations, and in their recognition of principles. Hence it is not at all surprising that very unlike judgments are formed in regard to almost every subject, and by no means least in respect to Geology. It is, therefore, no matter for wonder that we often hear utterances in praise and dispraise of this branch of knowledge. So, too, it is evident, because of diversity in the points of view from which even the same matters are regarded, that there is room, to say the least, for apparent contradictions; and thus for difficulties and objections, which need to be discussed, that they may be cleared up, and admitted or rejected, accordingly as they have or have not a valid foundation.

These objections and difficulties often result from comparative ignorance of the subject. Sometimes, perhaps, they come, though we trust not usually, from intentional misrepresentation. They more generally flow, as we are to presume, not from ill intent, but from simple misapprehension. Occasionally they are due to wrong modes of presenting the truth, and finally become real, though they be unintentional perversions of it. Or they may be only the seeming disagreements that arise from the contemplation of the same, or of closely related things under varying aspects. It is also frequently difficult, especially for persons not thoroughly conversant with given branches of knowledge, even though the main facts and principles lie before them, so to marshal and bring them to bear, as at once to solve all the perplexing problems, and remove the manifold objections that almost unavoidably arise.

On these accounts, and for many other reasons which need not be given, it may be well for us to look, somewhat in detail, at a few of the objections which are commonly urged against Geology, and to discuss them by use of the best means and in the clearest light at our command.

The first class of objections may take this form: *Geology is made up of extravagances, inconsistencies, and baseless theories.*

It is not unusual for persons, seemingly or supposed to be well versed in some departments of knowledge, to make a sweeping sentence of condemnation substantially like the above. They hear, or perhaps they have read, what appears to them extravagant or inconsistent; something, it may be, which evidently lacks a scientific foundation on which it can be legiti-



mately sustained and defended. Many individuals who make such assertions are, to a greater or less extent, honest and sincere. For this reason the implied objections should be candidly examined and sifted. So far as they are well founded let them be admitted. To just the extent they are false or undeserving of credence they are to be set forth in their true significance, that they may be rejected or treated according to their actual import.

As to the assumption, then, that Geology is made up of *extravagances*, it may be remarked that, because these actually exist, it does not necessarily follow that they are characteristic of the subject as a whole and as properly understood. That there are many fables and vagaries of a geological kind is a fact; they are also often associated with our branch of knowledge, and continually referred to it, even while they are by no means a part of it. The whims, aside from the important hints of Astrology, were, for long years, saddled upon Astronomy, although they were in no respect a legitimate portion of its contents. As in the instance cited, so in that of the subject before us, it must be admitted — indeed, we are ready at once and freely to concede — that not a few extravagant things have been said, and visionary claims urged, in connection with Geology. Some of the earlier advocates of this branch of inquiry, and occasionally a few of its so-called devotees at the present time, have made and may still advance statements little, if any, more trustworthy than the tales of the Arabian Nights' Entertainment. But these and such-like vagaries, while they are incident to the subject, do not belong to it. Indeed, it must be granted on every hand, and by each candid mind, that they in no way form an essential part of its matter. It should not, therefore, be burdened with them or made responsible for them. Being viewed as they are, however, they have done and are doing immense harm on this account. Many have been led to regard them as the sum and substance of what Geology has to teach, and thus to reject extravagances and solid truth alike without discrimination. In this case, as in other instances, one of the greatest drawbacks experienced by this science has come from the extreme assertions of some of its reputed friends; of friends who have been in the main sincere, but comparatively ignorant of its really strong and invincible points.

Again, the objection that Geology is made up of *inconsistencies* is to be looked at, in part certainly, in the same light. It is no doubt a fact that many inconsistent, that not a few even self-contradictory things have been, in the past, both held and asserted on this subject. In all probability the matter is not altogether different to-day. Not every one, surely, is master of the topics in which he is most deeply interested, and the claims of which he may from time to time advocate. It is a fact, moreover, that honest, intelligent, and well-informed persons may differ on various points

because they look at them under unlike phases, or since one is in a way to have more light, and to get a deeper insight, than another. But the topics themselves are not necessarily at fault, because incoherent views are held in regard to them; they are by no means answerable for the inconsistencies or differences of individuals, and they should not certainly be burdened with them.

In respect to the assertion that Geology is made up of *baseless theories*, it may be freely admitted that a great many visionary schemes and unsatisfactory explanations have been advanced in former days. Wild guesses and vague conjectures, without foundation in principle or support from facts, have been set up in the past as theories of the universe; and, perhaps, not a few of a like kind are put forward in the present. Looked at under one phase of the subject, it appears to be a great pity that such has ever been or is now the case. The damage from this source alone is not small. Still, there is another aspect under which the matter may be regarded. The seekings for light, and the trials of the schemes by which it is sought, often furnish better helps, and in the end bring about a broader and deeper insight of the truth than would else be found. In all branches save the pure mathematics (and to some extent in them),—in every department of mixed science,—suppositions are proposed in abundance, hypotheses propounded in great number,—hypotheses and suppositions which are never adopted, and which do not come to be recognized as constituent parts of the subjects in question. It is in this way that progress is made. The truth comes to be seen from manifold and widely varying points of view. By this means a broader, deeper, and more comprehensive knowledge is secured than would otherwise be possible. Meanwhile the hypotheses and suppositions, when they have served their purpose as transitory scaffoldings, are cast aside forever. These temporary stagings surely cannot be brought forward with justice, or so much as cited by any one who would be regarded reasonable, as a weighty objection to the permanent edifice which is constructed by means of their help.

Thus it should be evident that these objections in no wise hold valid against Geology as a science. There is no subject, perhaps, respecting which more or less has not been said by some in the way of opposition; none, doubtless, in regard to which even good men, resting under misapprehension, have not spoken unfavorably; none, probably, against which the extravagances or the inconsistencies of its friends may not be sometimes urged. And often the adverse statements have been about in proportion to the intrinsic importance and transcendent worth of the subject. That respecting which no severe judgments are passed is usually of little account. The best fruit-trees in an orchard, for the most part, give clearest evidence of assault and hard usage. It is no less so with those sciences, particularly

in their earlier stages, which are calculated to do most for the elevation of the individual, for the welfare of society, and for the advancement of the race. And then it should be granted without hesitation that Geology, whether its main principles be yet established beyond all controversy or not, comprises a field in respect to which there are innumerable points, up to this time, by no means determined. It should accordingly be clear that as a science, and so far as it is a science, Geology is one thing; while it may be quite another, looked at as a method of investigation, tending toward a systematic basis, and aiming by all legitimate means to extend the bounds within which it shall ultimately introduce a thoroughly scientific insight. This, in part, is the field in which it is doing its work; such the goal toward which its daily operations are pointing; of this kind the method by which it is from year to year making onward strides, probably unsurpassed in any other department of human inquiry.

Another class of objections meets us substantially as follows: *Geological deductions are premature.*

The meaning of this assertion of course is, that it is too early as yet to draw inferences from the data furnished by Geology. For this objection there must be some conceived reason or reasons. And such is the case. Many think, or seem to suppose, that this department of science, however it may be in the future, has thus far failed to become so settled in its facts and principles as to be deserving of confidence. There are others who appear to doubt whether its main positions as now understood be at all capable of establishment. The whole matter of objection is involved, perhaps, in the following statements: Geology has no well-recognized system of facts; or, if it have, this system is liable any day to be overturned; or, again, if there be some facts which have a trustworthy basis, no deductions should be drawn from them, until the whole circle of facts pertaining to Geology as a science be completed, and made to rest on a secure foundation.

Is it true, then, — to take these objections up in their order, — that there is *no well-recognized system of facts* of the kind in question? That our branch of science is not yet perfect; that its work is only just begun, though great advances have been already made; and that many important problems are still unsolved, geologists generally are ready to admit. It is also frankly conceded that not a few points are put forward by some who claim to be geologists which other and more careful investigators are not disposed, because they are not prepared on good grounds, to receive. This must necessarily be the case with any and with every branch of knowledge, in its preliminary stages, and especially with one which, like Geology, is in a state of rapid progress. But it may be remarked additionally, that there are many great series of facts which no geologist ever thinks of questioning, for they long ago ceased to be matters of doubt, — series of facts

which are generally, if not universally, recognized, — recognized by all who have given the subject sufficient attention to be qualified to form a trustworthy judgment upon it. We may take, as a single instance, and for the sake of illustration, the formations known as stratified, with their chronologic succession, — a point of immediate and obvious application as respects geologic time. Now no geologist doubts, in the first place, that there are sedimentary or stratified rocks, and that these exist in vast profusion; next, that there are certain grand divisions of these rocky beds which are designated as Palæozoic, Mesozoic or Secondary, and Cainozoic or Tertiary; or, again, that the Palæozoic formations, geologically considered, are always lower and more ancient than the Secondary; and that both these invariably precede the Tertiary; while they all are older than those of the present. It may be added that still smaller divisions are equally well recognized; such are the Silurian, Devonian, and Carboniferous; the Triassic, Jurassic, and Cretaceous; the Eocene, Miocene, and Pliocene. Were it needful, it would be easy to go further, and indicate by name various subdivisions belonging to each of these eras; that they are universally admitted among geologists, and never denied by any one, who is intimately conversant with the several sections of the crust of the earth. It is no less distinctly claimed that there is something in nature, answering to all these divisions and subdivisions; that there is also a distinct succession amongst them; and that no portion of this chronologic series ever fails to be true to itself, or to sustain its proper relations to the whole. It is true, and should be confessed, that in some cases the exact line of demarcation between one formation and another is a matter which is not as yet in all respects satisfactorily made out. But this is only a point of detail, which is every year coming to be more accurately defined; while the reality of this grand system of facts, as to all its more important features, is generally conceded without a question by all familiar with the subject. Substantially the same thing is true of many other great series of facts pertaining to the geologic record; but they cannot be set forth in this place; indeed, this bare reference to them is all that is needed, or can be expected, for the purpose in hand.

Granting, however, that there is a general recognition of such series of facts, the objector may add: they are, at any moment, *liable to be overthrown*; some new discovery may show that the view now taken of them is utterly untenable or false. We would not dogmatically affirm the opposite, or peremptorily deny that such may be the case. It is, perhaps, wiser and better to scan the subject closely, and discover whether there be any foundation for assertions of this kind. It should be admitted at the outset that there are many conjectures, and not a few assumptions, which are likely to fall to the ground, — assumptions and conjectures for which

such a destiny is expected by most, if not by all, well-informed geologists. But let us advance a step, and look at some particular series of facts; perhaps, for the sake of brevity and convenience, at the one already pointed out as generally received. Now, in reference to these facts, it may be said, that from the time of their first distinct recognition there has been, as to the essential points involved, not a single recession, but a constant advance; that there has been no backward movement, either in the methods of investigation, or in the results obtained, but an unbroken line of progress; and that the evidence, like that in all the well-established physical sciences, has been steadily accumulating, and now rests on a basis which in the eyes of the sober geologist is next to irrefragable. All the formations, from the Primordial to the present, are found in some place or other, between the summits of our mountains and the lowest depressions, the newer following the older in regular gradation; while each one of them has organic remains of a distinct specific character, found on no other horizon of the geologic record. There is accordingly brought to light a mass of evidence, which few sane persons at all conversant with the main facts, and with the principles that underlie them, can be so wild as to set at naught, or to regard as likely to be undermined or overthrown. It should thus be clear, that, judging from the past, — from the ceaseless and substantial advance, which has been made in geologic inquiry, up to this time, — we are authorized to look for a like stable progress in the future, if and so long as we find no valid evidence pointing in another direction.

But it has been lately *objected* that there is evidence of this kind. Recent deep-sea dredgings are revealing a type of existing life closely resembling that of a past age, say that of the Cretaceous. Hence it is inferred that the supposed succession of rocks already referred to is overthrown. As this objection is now attracting some attention in certain quarters, it may be well to give it a brief notice. We hardly wish to call it superficial, and yet it suggests that if the objectors be honest they are ignorant of the real testimony borne by these dredgings. It seems to be forgotten that all the main formations of the present period are still beneath the ocean; that they cannot, therefore, be the rocks which geologists have heretofore called Cretaceous; and, on the contrary, that the beds geologically known as chalk are, in many instances, so situated beneath the Tertiary strata that they cannot by any possibility be identical with those of recent times; and that thus they have been in no wise confounded with them, as the objection implies that they have. Again, it should be borne in mind that the resemblance is typical, a similarity in the type of life, while there is no evidence of specific identity, not a single species thus far found in the deep-sea dredgings being identical with any known species of the Cretaceous era. To remove all misapprehension, a few more words may be added by way of

elucidation. As we advance from the tropics toward the poles of the earth, or as we proceed from the sea-level under the equator toward the summits of the highest mountains, we observe a gradual change in the forms of life, — a passage from higher to lower types. The same is proving true, as our investigations are carried from the shores of the Atlantic toward the deeper parts of its as yet explored basin. All these organic forms, as should be remembered, belong to the present creation, although they furnish an immense gradation in the types represented. And what is thus observed as true of the present is doubtless the fact in respect to past ages. Gradations of life have probably revealed themselves to some extent under these three relations in every preceding period, and these generalizations are coming to be recognized by our best geologists, though as yet they have been by no means carried out as they should, and as in the future they no doubt will be. Man, as the noblest form of creation, in connection with some of the other high types of Mammalia, pre-eminently characterizes the present; meanwhile the lower grades of existing life are, in some respects, more characteristic of the past. Now, though there be a *typical* resemblance between Cretaceous forms and certain lower groups of recent times, there is by no means a *specific* identity.

This brief reference to typical characters in Zoölogy as distinguished from specific, to say nothing of types of life peculiar to each geologic age, may serve to show the untenableness of the inference drawn from deep-sea dredgings. At the same time it will perhaps indicate, though very inadequately, the validity of the foundation which geologic investigations are fast securing. Hence, as is hinted in this general way, and for various reasons which cannot be here given, the objection loses its supposed force, and is seen to be only part and parcel of the great hue and cry which sciolists at all times have been wont to put forth. If light only be brought to bear, difficulties at once begin to disappear and perplexities to vanish before its incoming power. Since this is the case, and that it may come to be so all the more, we should be careful not to forget that the facts which prompted the objection just under consideration are of vast moment. While they do not in the least impair the results already secured, they suggest that most important work is yet to be done by the geologist, in carrying out in respect to each past period all the main principles which are applicable to the existing order of things.

But admitting that some well-compacted systems of facts, with the principles which they involve, have been made out, and are not likely to be overturned, the objector may still urge that Geology is as yet *incomplete* as a science, and therefore that no deductions should be drawn from it. While this part of the objection is no doubt raised with somewhat of honesty, it should none the less be sifted, that its validity or invalidity may be seen.

Although many geologic problems be as yet unsolved, although there be facts in great number properly coming within the range of the geologist's scrutiny, which are up to this day unmastered, it is still true that there is a large body of matured results which rest upon a secure foundation. Now the question is, whether we may draw inferences from, and otherwise turn to account, this well-digested mass of knowledge which has already taken a scientific form. Without arguing the matter, a few suggestions may show in what light it ought to be regarded. It is surely not reasonable or wise for us to neglect to use what we know with good assurance, simply because there is much that is unfathomed, whether in the same or in a different department. No one says to a child, "You must not exercise your feet in walking, insomuch as you have not yet learned to run or jump," or "You should not walk at all, since you are still unable to walk perfectly." The mathematician is not blamed for employing the well-established portions of his Calculus, from the fact that there are other parts — from the fact that there are many points in Fluxions — which are thus far unsounded, or respecting which he still entertains doubt. Even so it seems preposterous to censure the geologist for drawing deductions from the portions of his science which he knows to be valid, because, forsooth, there is much up to this time unknown or wanting in certainty, and not a little in regard to which good observers are not agreed. Of course, persons not conversant with Geology, and all, in proportion to their ignorance of its real foundations, are precluded from making deductions from it. Inferences are properly drawn from it, and in respect to it by all such, and by such alone, as become conversant with what it teaches, — with what is and with what is not well established. And it may be added that the ablest investigators of the rocks are doing their best, day by day, to draw more clearly the distinction between that on the one hand which is valid, and all that on the other which is simply possible, doubtful, or improbable. Accordingly, the point urged by way of opposition, though it involve a grain of truth, is found, when stripped of its factitious surroundings and left alone, in no wise able to stand.

It should thus seem that the objections now under consideration, while their substance may be aptly opposed to certain wild theories and extravagant hypotheses, from time to time propounded, do not apply in any of their divisions to the essential parts of Geology, so far as we have been able to consider them. Indeed, the main portions of our science rest on as firm and substantial a foundation as any other branch of physical inquiry. And though many points, like some of the remoter nebulae in the heavens, be still unresolved, although there be a great deal yet to be done, there is none the less a large body of truth well considered and securely established, — a body of truth, respecting the validity of which in all its prominent features there is no room for doubt. And yet more, the less



well-defined portions are constantly coming, in a larger measure, under that careful and painstaking scrutiny, which invariably leads to accurate discrimination, and ultimately results in trustworthy determinations.

There is a peculiar class of objections which may be thus stated: *The Deluge is sufficient to account for all the main points of Geology.*

By "Deluge" is meant the flood, with which Noah's name is associated, and of which we have an account in the seventh chapter of the Book of Genesis. The expression, "main points of Geology," as above used, of course includes neither the creation, in the more restricted sense of the term, nor various other matters closely connected with it. Reference is made prominently to the fossiliferous formations, — to those strata, namely, which were laid down in water, and contain the remains of marine plants and animals, — and to the dislocations which they have undergone. Sea shells having been found in great abundance, many hundred miles from the ocean, imbedded both in the soil and in solid rocks, it has been said that they were carried inland, and at the same time buried, by the Deluge. It having been likewise clearly made out that these very strata, which contain organic remains of a marine character, were formed in water, this result also has been referred to the flood of Noah. So, it being discovered that these beds of rocks are often greatly disturbed; that they have been turned up on edge at all angles, in some places; that, in others, they have been even overturned; while, in many instances, they are badly fractured, or broken into pieces; it has been claimed by some that we have here another effect of the same Deluge. As these and similar statements have been both credited and denied, it may be proper to place them on the stand for examination. Let it be premised, however, that in what is about to be indicated there is no denial of the fact of the Noachian Deluge. That which is controverted is the sufficiency of the cause cited for the production of the effects ascribed to it by such as raise the objections.

In the first place, then, the *amount* of rocks formed from particles laid down in water is far too great to have been produced, even if the thing were in other respects reasonable, by the deluge in question. Most of these rocky beds afford unmistakable signs that their constituents were deposited in a calm, undisturbed sea, — that thus they must have required an immense lapse of time for their deposition, — and not in connection with a mighty rush of turbid waters. Taken together, and estimated as lying horizontally, these beds certainly equal sixteen miles in perpendicular height, or from base to summit. They are not, it is true, all found in any one place or country, but in various quarters of the globe. Still there is convincing evidence that no two consecutive portions of this great pile of rocks, as thus estimated, were formed at the same epoch. Each higher section, looked at geologically, was laid down at a point of time subsequent

to that occupied by each underlying bed. To refer such a result to the Deluge of Noah should therefore seem to be preposterous.

Again, it may be remarked that, if these stratified rocks were thus formed by the flood, *the plants and animals*, which were living at the time of their deposition, *would have been scattered through them promiscuously*. But such confusion — a medley of this kind, an indiscriminate blending of organic remains in the way supposed — is nowhere to be found. While fossils occur more or less frequently throughout this vast accumulation of sedimentary beds, still the traces of animals and plants which have lived on the face of the earth since the creation of man are only met with in a few thin layers of the topmost portion. They are not diffused at all through the inferior formations. There are, however, at the lowest admissible calculation, fossil remains answering to a series of some seventy periods, — to a series of seventy distinct creations, each one of which is as unique as that of the present, — found in rocks which are older than those characterized by existing species. And the time demanded for the deposition of the sediments peculiar to each one of these periods, according to clear indications, is certainly, on an average, four times as long as that yet occupied in the formation of the beds belonging to the existing order of things. So, when we look further, we find incontestable evidence, — such as the channel worn by the Niagara, as the southward extension of Florida by means of the forming coral reefs, — results effected since the most recent period began — that the older portions of the group of beds now in process of formation are comparatively of vast antiquity; of an antiquity many times more extended than the reputed age of man. Such being the case, that which is to be accounted for, — viz., the deposition of the whole mass of sedimentary rocks, — if supposed to have occurred during the lifetime of Noah, or say within six thousand years, requires perhaps a thousand times greater miracle than that really involved in the Deluge.

But, as should be observed further, the *disturbances* of the strata cannot be thus summarily disposed of, by simple reference to the Noachian flood. There is the plainest evidence that many of the rocks have been moved a great number of times, and at widely different epochs. The uptiltings have occurred, not all at once, or for the most part so, as the objector might suppose; not all, indeed, in a single period like the present, but in successive ages long preceding the existing order of things, and in eras in many instances separated from each other by a vast lapse of time. Between the earliest uplifts of the Primordial formations — formations known in this country as the Lower Taconic, in Great Britain as the Longmynd, or Lower Cambrian — and those of the latest Tertiary, beds, which in the aggregate are certainly from twelve to fifteen miles in thickness, were laid down substantially as sedimentary layers are in process of deposition in the Atlantic to-day.

Meanwhile the rocks bear testimony that, between these extremes, there was a long succession of intermediate disturbances. There are also undeniable proofs that, between one upheaval and another, even of the same bed of rocks, many hundred thousand years have, in some instances, intervened. Such being the merest summary of the facts, we see that a resort to the deluge of Noah as the cause of these remarkable upheavals and dislocations is altogether unsatisfactory, because utterly destitute of validity or practical weight.

We, therefore, conclude that the several forms of the objection implied in the explanation resorted to rest, so far as we are able to discover, on no secure foundation. Indeed, we cannot admit any such view for an instant, without running counter to a vast array of facts, with which the experienced geologist is as familiar as with the alphabet of his mother tongue. It may be said, however, by the objector that he is not familiar with these facts which are taught by Geology; that he is not acquainted with any such principles and necessities as are supposed to underlie them, and that, therefore, he does not recognize and cannot admit the weight ascribed to them. All this may be the case, and no doubt it often is; but if it be so, the objector has no right to sit in judgment. One may very properly decide that it is not worth his while to study Geology. In many cases, such a decision is perfectly legitimate, for no one can master every branch of knowledge. But those who thus decide should by no means set themselves up as judges. To presume to answer a matter before it is known was long ago termed folly. If this be a true definition of folly, it is to be feared that not a few are entitled to the attribute, even amidst the much-vaunted knowledge of this nineteenth century.

The next class of objections is to this effect: *The fossils relied on as evidence were, perhaps, created in the rocks as we find them.*

When it is said that organic remains were formed in the rocky beds substantially in the condition in which we now discover them in greater or less profusion, the implication is that they were never constituent parts of living animals and plants. The assertion, also, indicates that they were actually created in a state of greater or less petrefaction, with all the characteristics and evidences of adaptation which they would have possessed, had they really belonged to individuals which once lived, used their respective organs, and developed their several powers of life; that those portions which, so far as we know, are sometimes either worn away by use or damaged by mishaps, and are only repaired or recruited by vital processes, were arbitrarily made as if they had been thus worn, and recuperated or restored when such was not the case; and all this, not in respect to a few exceptional instances, but as applied to whole creations, and to many successive life-periods, of animals and plants. For example, a naturalist having found

what appeared to be a fossil rib of a vertebrate, which seemed to have been broken and to have grown together again, it was insisted that God formed it just so, without it ever having been an organic part of a once existing animal. Such, perhaps, is the substance, and it is intended to be a fair exhibition, of the series of objections involved in the statement as above made.

In reply, I would accordingly remark that, in the light of various well-determined facts, the view suggested seems *untenable*. The fossil remains so often met with in the different layers of the Sedimentary Rocks furnish every indication that they were once constituent parts of living organisms. When examined with the naked eye, an ordinary lens, or under the microscope, they reveal just the structure that they would have exhibited, so far as we can see, had they actually belonged to creatures of life, having such or similar forms, and appearing under conditions and surroundings supposed to be essential to animal existence. We may take as an illustration the eye of the Trilobite. This, so far as we can now judge, was in all respects adapted in its conformation to the light, as modified by the prevailing state of things, peculiar to the Palæozoic age, during the larger portion of which, as is generally admitted, this strange tribe of Crustaceans flourished. Then there is, for the most part, a regular gradation, which we may see in an important sense to be true, as we proceed from the earliest rocks containing fossils up to the latest; very much such a gradation as we may presume there would have been in case there had been a prearranged and on the whole an orderly progress, in both vegetable and animal life, suited to the advancing stages of the world. And this progressive movement, if fossils speak the truth, — and we are to infer that all God's works do this, — has been going on from era to era, beginning with comparatively low types of existence, and slowly but steadily tending upward toward the highest forms of organization found in the present. So each period presents the mingled phases of life peculiar to itself, and lying all the way between what, on the one hand, are comparatively very simple, and what, on the other, are the most complex forms thus far reached; the organisms of each geologic cycle being, all things considered, an advance on what had preceded; and yet, while always anticipating, perhaps never overleaping or surpassing, the more perfect which were to follow. Surely such a representation of living existence in what we usually regard as its past phases, if that existence itself in its supposed earlier stages be only scenic and imaginary, would not be a display of substantial truth. Indeed, it implies what we are not ready for a moment to admit as a fact, — since we have a world of evidence that constrains us to deny, — that there ever was, or that there is a single instance of such deception, on the part of the Supreme Creative Mind.

Again, looking at Omnipotence abstractly, and apart from all other attributes, — admitting, for the moment, that we can in this way conceive the possibility of such a creation as the one supposed, — it seems none the less *improbable*. We fail to find any stable ground on which it can be made to appear valid. So far as we know, indeed so far as we can reasonably conceive, the Divine power regulates itself, and is directed in perfect wisdom. To take a single point: there is always evidence of use, present or prospective, in everything that has been made; of an adaptation of means to ends, with a wise purpose and an unerring foresight. This, of course, is not the highest view of the matter, but it is *a* view, and one of importance. All created things, then, so far as we can judge, imply some use. Such, we infer, must have been the case with those forms which are only known as fossil. And in supposed consonance with this position it has been urged, that a creation of fossils of the kind referred to — an outright creation of medals, as they have been happily called — might be a source of discipline to man. This, as we must admit, recognizes them to be things of utility. True; but so they are equally, nay more, when they are regarded as the remains of once living organisms, — without the cheat involved in the above supposition. And, then, why have medals of reigns and dynasties of life which never had existence? Such a thing in archæology or history, if carried out intentionally, would be called imposture. Shall we hold views in regard to creation which imply this much, and virtually ascribe it to the Creator? Once more, let us remember that this is not the only view of the matter. It has been already suggested, that there is usually an immediate use, or preparation for use, in every work of creative power; and this is a primary consideration. There is likewise a remote benefit, which in one aspect is of secondary regard; this may find its realization, or reach its predetermined end, indirectly; it comes, for the most part, independently of human expectation, and often in ways which we do not anticipate. The result once appearing, however, we recognize it as legitimate. Looked at in this light, we fail to discover an immediately useful, we are unable to get a glimpse of any directly or remotely prospective end, of special value and honest import, which could be subserved by an arbitrary creation of fossils in the way indicated. Indeed, we cannot, thus far, find a solid and trustworthy basis, on which to rest such an assumption, and by virtue of which we may fairly ascribe to it any probability.

But, as should be observed further, we are so constituted that, when we come to view matters as they really are, our belief in such a creation is *impossible*. Indeed, when we learn to see things in their appropriate light, and to understand what creation reasonably involves, we are totally unable to receive, or at least permanently to retain, a supposition of this kind. It is possible for us, it is true, to make a great many fanciful conjectures, and

perhaps persuade ourselves into a blind adherence to them. We may dwell upon them, as we think, with satisfaction, and hold to them for a long while, provided we do not put them to a practical test. Indeed, when one rejects the illumination of truth only to peer into its opposite, it is not easy to tell how dark the light within him may become. If, however, in such instances, we only open our eyes to the light which shines for all, and come to see things as they actually exist, the irrationality of our vague suppositions and wild guesses is rendered apparent. Our mental constitution is of a make not to allow us in this case to continue our confidence in them. In short, we are utterly unable longer to give them credence, however much we may desire or try to do so, if we only look at facts under the illuminating agency of truth. All this is so, because we at once see and are made to feel, that our preconceptions are not reasonable.

An instance will illustrate this point. We dig into the ground ; as our good fortune would have it, we come upon a buried axe, or an adz, or possibly an auger. So doing, we directly infer, as we observe its parts and discover its peculiar adaptation, that it was constructed by a rational being for a given purpose ; or, as we may equally well say, that God brought about the result through the freely directed activity of man. According to either mode of representation, we suppose that its existence indicates real design, and points to a particular kind of use, or to a variety of uses. But just then a good neighbor, coming along, perhaps says, No, it was created in the soil just as you found it. It was never made by human instrumentality, it grew there ; or, as possibly he would say, it came there, simply to show the divine power. Examining the axe, if such it be, with closer scrutiny, we discover that, a piece having been broken out of its edge, it was afterward repaired, and perhaps filed or ground. As we point to this new evidence, our would-be-thought reverent and wise neighbor exclaims with astonishment, or it may be with consternation, What ! do you deny the Divine Omnipotence ; do you doubt God's power so to make an axe, that it shall appear to have been broken and mended, or in some wise repaired ? In reply, perhaps I may say, No. So doing, I give what in one sense is a true answer. And yet, in spite of all this, I am not convinced that such is the divine mode of working. Notwithstanding what is said, I cannot really believe, and you could not, that the axe came there as suggested. Indeed, I must believe, or violate the law of my rational being, something very different from my neighbor's supposition.

This test may be briefly applied to the organic remains of extinct creations. A naturalist discovers a fossil. He studies it in all its parts, and as a whole, under every light he can get. Comparing it with similar forms of the present, and with all its known analogues of past ages, he begins to understand its relations. He gradually discovers a curious and wonderful

mechanism, an adaptation in every particular of a given grade of life, to the circumstances peculiar to it. There finally dawns upon him, what he never so much as dreamed of before; contemplating the workmanship of the Most High, he catches glimpses of the plan and order of Creation; taking a tooth, or a single important part characteristic of an extinct species before unknown, but akin to groups with which he is acquainted, he can, from that fragment, reconstruct the animal, and thus almost recreate the dead forms of a remote past. From time to time he possibly discovers bones, or shells, or some portions of extinct organisms, which were to all appearances once broken and afterward repaired, seemingly by vital processes. Thus he comes to know the creatures that flourished in bygone ages, often even in their minutest peculiarities, almost as he does those of the living present. As his investigations go on, he makes out a degree at once of complication and delicacy of structure far surpassing everything connected with an axe, an adz, or an auger, or even with the most intricate mechanism of modern ingenuity; indeed, what utterly exceeds human contrivance, anticipates man's most boasted inventions, and has every mark that it was once used, as its appearance indicates. Now, with such evidence staring him in the face, can we for a moment suppose that, if he be honest, he is able to regard the fossils which lie before him as the mere results of arbitrary caprice, or that he finds room to doubt that they were once endowed with life, and remain as witnesses of its activity? He must believe what they claim to be, else deny his mental constitution, and throw to the winds all the foundations of rationality.

Such being the case, we find no reasonable possibility, on the ground of which the view of creation implied in the objection now under discussion can rest. In fact, when we come to see things as they really are, that is, in the light which pertains to their constitution and relations, it is impossible, for an instant, to believe the suppositions which underlie this class of objections. To cling to them tenaciously, after the incoming of light on these points, would be to unhinge our deepest convictions, because it virtually ignores the only solid foundation for confidence, no less in the constitution of our minds than in the "Cosmos" and in its author. Taking this course, we should unmoor ourselves from all principle,—indeed, from everything stable and really trustworthy,—and find ourselves floating without anchor or compass, chart or helm, driven hither and thither by the uncertainties of ever-shifting phenomena, on the restless waves of a shoreless ocean. But such is not the character of truth, or of the laws of our mental constitution. The tendency of both is toward a standing-ground, which is no less reasonable than secure. Once clearly seeing eternal verities,—the immutable laws of nature, or of mind,—we must accept them, or prove false alike to creation, to ourselves, and to the Source of all substantial



reality. And so we are rationally constrained to have essentially the same convictions in regard to the fossil remains of extinct species that we do respecting the living forms of our own time. To say that those of the present period are real products of organic life, and that all of each preceding era are mere semblances, when the most important difference between them, so far as we can see, is for the most part simply that of species, genera, or families belonging to diverse times, is to be guilty of the grossest inconsistency. As illustrative of this point, we may cite a familiar instance. Let a boy pick up, amid old rubbish, a knife bearing the impress of 1775, — a knife the blade of which, having been of good stuff, had been used until it was ground to a stub. Now convince him, if it be possible, that the old blade which he holds in his hand was not made for cutting; or, to carry out the analogy still more closely, that all the contrivances ordinarily called knives, which were manufactured previous to the year 1800, while very much like those of to-day, were never intended for any of the practical purposes for which such instruments are now employed. This, as we all well know, is plainly out of the question. So take a skilful palæontologist, who finds in a fossil condition — to select a very simple instance — a worn tooth or a broken tusk of an animal belonging either to an extinct or to an existing species, — some preserved portion of an Ichthyosaurus, it may be, — and convince him, if it be in any way reasonably possible, that the fragment which he holds in his hand, while it exactly resembles a tooth, a tusk, or some other fossilized organic part, was never used as such, and in no wise ever formed a constituent portion of a living creature. He sees the thing somewhat as it is in itself; not merely as an isolated outward object, but in the light of many closely connected principles involving manifold necessary relations; and his convictions consequently rest on an immovable basis. The conclusion, of course, is evident and inevitable. So is it everywhere. As such comes to be the case in respect to the myriads of interesting points before us, — and this must be the result, if people faithfully study the facts which are staring them in the face, — all the objections connected with them begin to fade into thin air; they scatter, and will eventually disappear altogether, like mists before the rays of the rising sun.

But, after all that has been said, the objector may still add: *The Periods of Geology contradict the Mosaic account of Creation.*

There has been a more or less general impression, that the geologic view of the formation of the earth is at variance with the Mosaic cosmology, and, probably, with the narrative and implications of the Scriptures at large, on all kindred topics. Presuming that there is an irreconcilable difference of this kind, the inference from the objection is, that we are to reject the evidence of Geology. Should it appear that there is a

general agreement between the Biblical account fairly interpreted, and "the testimony of the rocks," — as close a harmony as could be reasonably looked for, under the circumstances, — it will of course be unnecessary to discuss, in this place, the relative validity of these two sources of evidence. It is accordingly our aim to find out, by an unprejudiced examination of the facts, whether there be any such consistency, in which the heart may rest at once securely and fondly because the understanding is clearly convinced. In doing this it is not proposed to take the matter up minutely, but simply to examine some of the more salient points. The main difficulties, perhaps, — those, at least, which usually strike people as most patent, — are connected with the extended periods, on which the palæontologist insists with great earnestness and pertinacity. Now it is urged by some that the supposed length of these ages conflicts with the word "day," as used in the Scriptures; that the order of the succession of events, as associated with these long eras, is at variance with that of the several days' work as given by Moses; and, finally, that there is no evidence, either in Nature or in the Bible, of any such thing as the gradual advance, and the progressive processes in creation, usually taught by geologists. To these distinctive points we may devote a few remarks.

In order to a right understanding of the word *day*, or of the length of one of the recognized measures of time supposed to be connected with what was done, we need to take several things into consideration. The Hebrew noun, translated "day," primarily means a coming round, a cycle; and hence a period, a way-about, a revolution; thus, generally, a circle or a completed circuit. This could be applied to any "round" or duration of time; usage confined it for the most part and ordinarily to a period of twenty-four hours; or it denoted what we might call a single revolution of the earth on its axis. But this is not all; the term is employed in various senses, even in the short Scriptural account of creation. It is first made to designate light in general, — "God called the *light day*." Next it is applied to the evening and the morning; they are termed day before the appearance of the sun, — "the *evening* and the *morning* were the first day." So it is used to designate them after the sun appeared, — "the evening and the morning were the *fifth day*." Once more, the season of light in each of the several cycles is called day in a general sense, — "Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven, to divide the *day* from the night." Then, in the very same verse, the duration of both the light and the darkness of each entire cycle is spoken of generally as day, — "Let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for *days* and years." Still again, the whole compass of time occupied by the work of creation is designated as "*the day* in which the Lord God made the earth and the heavens." Such is something of the multiplicity of meanings which this little word has in the compendious account given us of the creative work in the first part of Genesis.

If, now, we glance at other portions of the Scriptures, we may find further evidence of its great variety of import, and thus see that we cannot reasonably restrict the term in any arbitrary manner as simply answering to twenty-four hours. We read of the day of an individual, for instance, "the day of Jezreel," "the day of the Son of Man"; the day of a city, or of a people, as "the day of Jerusalem," "the day of Israel," — expressions which may mean the lifetime of the person, or a marked point in his life; the golden period of a metropolis, or the time of its doom; the duration of a nationality, the foreboded epoch of its destruction, and the like. So Jesus says, "Abraham desired to see my day"; that is, my time, the new era of the gospel, the revelation — even as the incoming of spiritual light is the day, that is, the revelation — of the kingdom of truth and love. In one instance Jehovah is represented as saying, "I have appointed thee each day for a year"; in this case, of course, a single day stood for three hundred and sixty-five days, or thereabout. Again, we are informed that the Redeemer "shall stand at the latter day upon the earth"; His word "shall judge in the last day." Surely the term "day" as here used can hardly mean merely twelve or twenty-four hours. Once more we are told, "the day of the Lord cometh, the great day of the Lord." In all these cases the language evidently denotes far more than a natural day; something very different from the time occupied by the earth in revolving once upon its axis. In some of the instances cited, if not in them all, the word clearly points, among other and probably more important indications, to a long period. In this wise, perhaps, we may understand the ninetyeth Psalm as contrasting the brevity of human life with the creative days of the Most High. And the Apostle Peter, referring to the works of creation and of judgment, says, "One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day."

Thus, as it should be now evident, there are various kinds of days. We have a day of twenty-four hours. Amongst the Jews there were also many other days, some of which might be represented as cycle within cycle, certainly to the third and fourth degree. This, to cite no other instance, must surely be clear to such as have mastered the import of the Jewish Sabbath and of the "day of Jubilee." Then the Scriptures in many places speak of man's day, which is comparatively short, seldom exceeding three-score years and ten. There is also, to make no additional references, the day of the Lord; and this, as we ought surely to admit, is a great day, in most, if not in each, of the several senses that may be given to it.

Accordingly, when we are called to interpret the word "day," we may legitimately have reference to the agent who acts in the time or state specified, to the work engaged in or performed, and to the manifold surroundings and concomitants, either implied or expressed. Thus a man

within the tropics, when he speaks of a day, may mean one thing, while perhaps the term indicates quite another to an inhabitant of Spitzbergen or Nova Zembla. To those who live in the Arctic or Antarctic regions, the word "day" in its natural use may signify either six or twelve months, accordingly as they include in it simply light, or darkness and light; and a day's work, with them, is to be judged in consonance with their estimate of the term. So, when we speak of the mighty creative acts, may we not regard them as the stupendous operations of God, and their effects as his sublime handiwork? Then, too, if the language of Scripture be an adaptation to man's comprehension, should we not suppose each day's work to be that of one of the great days of the Lord, as seems to be clearly implied in the ninetyeth Psalm? If we explain the matter otherwise, are we really and profoundly consistent? By "consistent" we mean what the word properly implies under all relations; not consistent superficially, and in the mere letter, but consistent as well with the inmost import, scope, and tenor of the Sacred Writings, as with the deepest convictions of our hearts. Now these questions need to be pondered, carefully weighed, before we decide to reject the evidence of nature; thoroughly considered before we conclude to cling to the Scriptures merely in the letter, and in a spirit possibly at war with their legitimate tendency; profoundly discussed that we may know whether they be the oracles of light and life, and if so, that we may so receive them as to be able to give a reason for our faith. According to the exposition just suggested, the Bible is made to be its own interpreter; it is expounded in its own light, and, not excluding that of nature, by the aid of all the illumination to be secured from any and from every source. And the interpretation hinted at is surely not irreverent, either in its method or in its results. It is certainly according to the analogy of faith, a comparing of Scripture with Scripture. And, what is more, it may perhaps seem becoming and reasonable, if we would not by implication cast indignity on the Most High, and on the wonderful works of His hands.

In confirmation of this view, which we do not profess to adopt, but simply to suggest as a help to those who have no better, it may be added that even Josephus hints that the term "day," as it occurs in the first chapter of Genesis, has a special import. He speaks of the word as referring on its earliest occurrence, not to an ordinary, but to a "peculiar" day. And the original Hebrew seems to point to such, or to a closely cognate meaning, and thus to justify the interpretation of the Jewish historian. Augustine, also, as is evident from his Confessions and from some of his other writings, took a similar view of the matter; while that learned divine and philosopher of the seventeenth century, Henry More, with others whom we need not mention, occupied substantially the same ground. Now these men all lived and wrote long before Geology existed as a science, and, therefore,

before it was known, or in any wise thought of as in conflict with the Scriptures. Accordingly, should we take this view of the subject, which is thus seen to be no merely shrewd afterthought, adopted simply with a design to elude objections and evade difficulties, we need find no necessary conflict between the extended periods of Geology and the creative days of the Lord as described by Moses.

We are next to notice the *order of succession*, in the events referred to the several creative days, and endeavor to discover whether it be in essential harmony with the geologic record. In our study of the Mosaic account of creation, we should ever bear in mind that the author has not used, for he did not know, the technical terms of modern science; that his point of view is different from that of our text-books, and thus from much that is coming to be current even amongst those who are not conversant with scientific investigations; in short, that he describes things as we may presume they would appear to an observer, and without any reference at all to what we perhaps regard as scientific. It was clearly his aim to call attention to the great First Cause. He accordingly exhibited the works of creation, as the outgoing of the divine might; he set forth phenomena as a popular and impressive illustration of the Omnipotence and Unity of the Supreme Author of the universe; at the same time he flashed upon the mind the just claim of the Creator to our reverence, gratitude, and worship. Such being the case, we may well suppose that he gives, as he might very naturally exhibit, the succession of events under the form of acts, stages of progress, or days of work, if one prefer the latter designation. And he could in no wise give a more vivid impression of the divine agency than by presenting in some such way the grand results, or what would strike one as the sublime outflowings, of the several exertions of power, substantially as we may suppose they must have appeared; indeed, as they would appear to contemplative minds, before which the successive scenes might rise in visions, as they gazed upon the works of creation, and caught glimpses of its profound and unfathomable mysteries. This suggestion may enable us readily to understand that the order of appearances could be true, as that of appearances, especially when they were set forth briefly and without minuteness of detail; and that still they might vary somewhat from the exact order of science. A simple instance will make this matter clear. To the common observer, and in fact to every one, the sun seems to rise; and this seeming is an actual fact of appearance. In the view of the scientist, the earth revolves on its axis, so that the sun in appearing to rise really stands still; and this is a fact of science. Now, in the one case and in the other, the facts are equally actual; meanwhile the points of view are very unlike; so the order and mode of presentation are widely different. With this, or some similar illustration in

mind, we may perhaps discover a substantial, nay, a wonderful correspondence between the Mosaic representation and the scientific. As a help in this direction, let us pass the several successive steps in rapid review, as they are perhaps to be understood.

The *opening* act is the combined creation of the heavens and of the earth, in their elementary phases. Associated with it is the origination of light. In this aspect of the subject, there is no essential disagreement between the two accounts.

On the *second* day, there is a forward movement. Its work may be regarded as the orderly separation of the matter of the earth from that of the various other bodies of the solar system. Here, too, all is harmonious.

With the *third* day we have the formation of dry land, its division from the waters, and the introduction of vegetable life. Existing rocks, and various related considerations indicate that plants did not long precede animals. But foliage would be the prominent object of vision. The lower grades of animate existence, such as Radiates, Mollusks, and Articulates, being usually of comparatively small size, it is not surprising that they receive no notice, in a summary view; in fact, it would have been a marvel, had they been distinctly named. So, too, as the earlier forms of vegetable and animal life bear more or less close external resemblance, they might appear as scarcely distinguishable. And, in an important sense, it was only the more rudimentary types that first made their ingress and exit; still, as the subject was mentioned, we may suppose that higher forms of vegetation, as shrubs and trees, were summarily referred to, in anticipation of the work of subsequent days. Thus, in the main, the language of the narrative is a natural representation of things, as we may suppose they would seem to a spectator. Hence, also, the account, as being only a brief compend, is, to all the intents and purposes involved, substantially correct. We, likewise, see that the omission to announce the introduction of rudimentary animal forms, and the reference, perhaps in the way of anticipation, to the higher grades of plant-life which were yet to come, may be regarded as no essential violation of the facts, as they actually occurred.

During the *fourth* day witness is borne to light under a new phase; the sun is made to *appear*. Up to about this time, as physicists tell us, and so we are led to infer from various considerations, what we now call the air was so densely loaded with gases and steam that the rays of the heavenly orb could scarcely penetrate the thick vaporous envelope of the globe. Of course, along with the clearing up of the atmosphere, — although no reference be made to the points, — the previously formed matter was constantly undergoing changes, and in various ways subserving its destined ends; while the already introduced vegetation continued to advance, in connection with the inferior forms of animal life, with which it kept even pace.

Hence, on the *fifth* day, as only the more prominent aspects of things are set forth, with such new appearances as are most striking to the view, there is no further distinctive account of the vegetable kingdom. Meanwhile, direct mention is made of various kinds of living creatures, from some of the lower phases of the animal kingdom up to beasts of prey and other kindred forms.

In this wise, we are naturally led to the work of the *sixth* day, or the introduction of the superior classes of animals; reference is especially made to those grades known as Mammalian, and, finally, to Man, as the crowning work of creation. Here we have the noblest and most perfect type yet known, — a type respecting which Geology bears witness, and to which it adds nothing higher; besides which, it has nothing so grand, so majestic, and complete.

Such is a brief synopsis of the Mosaic narrative of the creation, given not as a whole, but with special reference to the point now under consideration. Looked at as a description of things as they might appear to an observer, leaving out minutiae, grouping large classes together in a summary manner, and being intended largely for moral and religious uses, the record and its author are seen to be, even as respects the orderly succession of events, in essential harmony with the testimony furnished by the Book of Nature.

According to the method proposed, we are now to consider that part of the objection which implies that there neither is in fact nor in the teaching of the Bible any such thing as the *gradual advance and progressive processes* taught by geologists. On this point a few words, and only a few, are needful. A minute consideration of the matter would be plainly out of place in this article. Such persons as would enter into details and see the subject somewhat in its length and breadth, its depth and height, are referred at once to the rocks themselves, and to standard treatises on Geology. Let us, then, cursorily glance at only a few of the more salient aspects of the point in question.

That the earth on which we live shows signs of advancement, from simpler to more complex forms; of progress, from lower to higher phases of existence; of onward movements, from elementary states toward such as involve great intricacies and marvellous complexity of structure; of almost endless gradations, from the most rudimentary stages up to those which embrace an untold manifoldness, as well in complication and variety of parts as in delicacy of organization, — is claimed on all hands by geologists. This being so, every one who is interested in the matter is at liberty to take up their statements on the point in question, and examine them in detail for himself; and most especially should he have recourse to the testimony of the rocks themselves, which are in this case the original docu-



ments. And of such an examination, particularly if it be faithful and long continued, no one needs for a moment to doubt the result. In each and in every department of human inquiry, truth as clearly seen always points in one direction; and, when it is sincerely followed, it invariably leads toward a single ultimate goal.

But the objection seems to imply that the Scriptural account of creation fails to exhibit gradation and progressive movements. While such may be the fact in regard to many interpretations, and while not a few persons appear to regard the teaching of the Scriptures as adverse to almost every kind of progression, the question may be well and fairly raised, whether this implication be true. Let us merely interpret the Mosaic narrative as we should, — it may almost seem as we must, if we be honest and candid, — remembering that, usually, only grand results are given, and that, for the most part, scarcely any of the steps involved are stated. Simply doing this, we shall see that even that narrative is a wonderful exhibition of progressive movement. It is, perhaps, the most marvellous instance and witness we have within so small a compass of ceaseless advancement from the simplest and most elementary aspects of things upward toward higher, more complicated, and intricate structures; of endlessly varying progress, until we reach man, — the acme, so far as we know, of physical perfection. We start with the formation of the rudiments of the heavens and of the earth. These pass through various modifications; they are subject to manifold operations, and undergo successive transformations, until the earth becomes a distinct body. From this point, also, it continues to advance, meeting change after change, and is finally fitted to sustain plants and animals. And these, with the matter already formed, go on ceaselessly doing their appropriate work, and, under manifold relations, fulfilling their important missions. In this, and in what follows, there are steady marches forward and upward; regular advances through all the grades of plant life and of animal organization; progressive movements from the lowest onward toward the highest, until at last the way is prepared for a being superior to all that went before, — for a being bearing the image of the Creator, and clothed in "the human form divine." If in this the Scriptures do not suggest, nay, plainly teach, marked gradations, progressive processes, and constant advancement in the work of creation, it is difficult to tell where we may expect to find evidence of progress, of ceaseless, steady, upward movement, — or even a hint of what we ought to mean by the term.

Thus we fail to find, so far as we have looked at the matter, any essential disagreement between the periods of Geology and the Mosaic account of creation. There are statements, it is true, that may seem to be at variance; still, as it is thought, a fair and honest exposition is able, in a large

measure, to remove the apparent conflicts, and to bring out a degree of substantial unison which few, if any, on taking everything into account, would have expected. Here, as elsewhere, the surface may be ruffled by opposing ripples, or even agitated by warring billows, while the deep undercurrent is mainly set in one direction. Although the points of view occupied by Moses and the geologists be different, although in many respects their positions be diverse, there is clearly a general and unpremeditated, if we may not say fundamental, agreement between them. But not this alone: long-continued study of the subject has convinced us that there is far more conformity in particulars, even in many of the minor details, than might have been anticipated. This is especially evident when we remember the very unlike scope and tendency prominently manifest in the Scripture narrative and in the investigations of naturalists. Bearing in mind these marked differences in the points of view, and, as we may also add, even the diversity in aims and purposes, we can hardly fail to be forcibly struck by the unexpected coincidences, the perpetually recurring harmonies, in all that is of vital importance. Indeed, while the Scripture version of the matter is not, and does not profess to be, scientific in our sense of the term, and according to the prevailing aspects of modern science, it still presents under phenomenal phases some of the very materials which the scientist recognizes, and upon which he works. And this is not all: elements of the deepest Philosophy and of the profoundest Theology run through its whole texture; they so pervade the account which is at once history, prophecy, and poetry, as to render it one of the most astounding marvels of literature, if it be not, when all things are considered, the greatest wonder of the world.

Having now considered some of the main objections to Geology, we may add a few *closing* suggestions.

The preceding discussion has been from what may be regarded, and perhaps with propriety, as a common-sense point of view. For the most part, as it is thought, the matter has been taken up in a light, and with an appeal to powers, common to humanity. It has been the aim to look at the difficulties suggested without bias,—independently of all parties and schools, of every sect and denomination,—to get at some of the more important phases of the truth, and to present such suggestions as might naturally occur to any candid person thoroughly familiar with the facts, though not necessarily conversant with the more philosophic aspects of the subject. Indeed, the philosophy of the matter, in the strict sense of the term, has been purposely avoided. This course has been taken, not because such discussions have no place,—for we propose to say much in this direction, on some future occasions,—but from the fact that the time has not yet come, in our judgment, for that higher and abiding conciliation

which can be only secured, if at all, in the light and by the help of a distinctively Spiritual Philosophy. Our scientists no less than our theologians have been for the most part in the past, and are largely at this hour, one-sided in the sense that neither has been or is thoroughly and professedly conversant with the practical details of *both* sides of the great problems in question. Few are as yet masters of the facts in each domain alike, — equally profound and at home in the two provinces, — and thus prepared to take them up in their whole range with ease, to discuss them with freedom, and place them on a broad philosophic basis. To some master mind or minds, possessed of a philosophic spirit, and thus able to marshal the vast array of facts, we must look in the end for a satisfactory adjudication of the great questions at issue. Meanwhile enough, as we trust, has been offered in this article, on various relations of the subject under consideration, to give us a steadfast assurance that we may securely hold, at once to the legitimate teachings of Geology, and to the Scriptures as fairly interpreted. On this vantage-ground as our basis, several inferences may be drawn from the premises already secured.

In view, then, of what has been advanced, and on the supposition that the discussion of the *few* objections which have come before us be valid and satisfactory, we are prepared to presume for the moment that *all* the objections to Geology may be met and disposed of in a reasonable way. It is very true that we have not taken into consideration much that has been, or that may be, urged against studies of this kind. But, having canvassed several of the more prominent points that have been thus far brought against them, and having found that they may be fairly and readily rebutted, when looked at in the light of eternal principles, or, as in this case, according to the nature of things, we are led to feel strong confidence that such will be the fact in respect to the minor difficulties which have not been directly noticed, and to any that may come up in the future. Of course, this is not proved, and no one should claim it as established; it is only a presumption, which may, and, if our expectations be valid, will gain ground as our light increases. Meanwhile, the time of its ultimate realization depends much upon the proviso, that investigations be kept within legitimate bounds, and the truth brought out in its own clear and invincible light. The principles of Geology being the same as those of nature, and thus answering to the eternal, creative ideas of God, must be true. Accordingly, those that have been thus far made out with certainty can be received with confidence, while such as are not yet discovered must be equally valid; and they are to be sought after with perfect trust that, when they are found and clearly elucidated, they will be seen to be thoroughly consistent with those already known. Indeed, though they may appear for a season, they are in no wise able really, to conflict with any great principles, either in

the domain of nature or in the realm of eternal spirit. And, being of this character, we may with the most tranquil assurance believe that their most varied outworkings will be gradually recognized as harmonious exhibitions of the Supreme First Cause, and thus as consonant with all the prescripts of reason and truth.

Again, we are led to see that the study of Geology is able to give us a broader, deeper, and more comprehensive view of nature. It is adapted, and as properly taught, it is intended to lead us into sympathy with the works of creation; to set us upon an investigation of the outward world in a greater and to an ever-enlarging degree; to impart to us an insight of its depths, such as we can nowhere else get; and to widen out our apprehension of its vast domain, beyond the power perhaps of any other branch of science. And it is not merely general views and comprehensive outlines of the globe that it imparts. It is fitted to lead us to a minute and intimate knowledge, passing all our present conceptions, of the manifold and endlessly varying processes that have been operative in bringing the earth up to its existing condition. There is no end to the fields for inquiry which open out before us, as we push our investigations in any single department of this inexhaustible subject. Hence we cannot readily fail to recognize that it affords ample room for intellectual discipline; that as we pursue the study, our views of the world in which we live must necessarily broaden, deepen, and expand to an ever-increasing extent; and that nature itself is likely in this way to appear to us as a new book, written all over with characters which become more and more legible as we go forward with our researches in this fascinating and rapidly advancing branch of knowledge.

On the other hand, we may see that the study of Geology is calculated to help us to a broader, deeper, and more comprehensive understanding of the Scriptures. As we have heretofore hinted, spiritual truth is set forth in the Bible, first, by means of words which were primarily applicable to visible objects in nature; next, by the use of metaphors or terms which were originally drawn from the same source, but have come to be used in a figurative sense; and, finally, by the employment of symbols, that is, words answering to something in nature, by the help of which spiritual realities are as it were flashed forth in their own peculiar light, since there is an analogy between them and the powers which are operative in the world around us. Such being the case, it is of vast moment that we have an intimate acquaintance with nature, with the actual objects, the names of which form the material of Scripture language, the visible pictures of which are the storehouse of its imagery, and the living processes connected with which are the basis of the analogies through which the power of moral and religious verities is made significant to our minds and real to

our hearts. A knowledge of this kind, when properly brought to bear, renders the Scriptures in a sense transparent. By its aid we are enabled to look through and beyond the letter, even beyond the *letter* which otherwise kills; for the Scriptures, to such as read them only in their verbal form, are as a veil, often concealing rather than revealing their essential import; but, learning to regard the words as symbols of spiritual reality and power, we may get glimpses of that which is behind the veil, and which no audible or visible terms can adequately portray. And such a knowledge helps us to free the spiritual element as exhibited under finite forms and individual conceptions, from the human limitations and idiosyncrasies with which it is connected, and thus to behold it in its universality and eternal essence. Now Geology, probably in a larger measure than any other department of inquiry, is able to give us this acquaintance with nature, and thus to help us to a just appreciation of human language which is founded upon it, and intended to be used as an organ of the spirit. Since this is so, we may readily understand how it is suited, if properly employed, to lead us to a knowledge of the Scriptures at once wider, profounder, and more nearly all-encircling than we should else be likely to gain. Although the Bible be a revelation of spiritual truth, and each may apprehend as much as he is ready to receive, still no one can understand it in a thoroughly exhaustive way — enter into the length and breadth, the depths and heights of its import — without a deep insight into nature. And yet this insight, as we should always remember, is not an acquaintance with truth as spiritual; it is only a means to it. So far as itself alone is concerned, it is simply an insight into nature. But nature itself is a revelation of the so-called natural attributes of Jehovah. The very creation of the world is accordingly a step preparatory to the higher manifestations of the Most High; and a familiarity with it is consequently a means to our better apprehension of Him in this wise manifested, as spiritual or *supernatural*, therefore of him as Lord of nature, and thus as the very substance of the Scriptures in their essential import and power.

Again, the study of Geology is suited to introduce a broader, deeper, and more comprehensive interpretation of the Scriptures; and thus to secure a higher standard of excellence in the pulpit, in literature, and in art. We are better fitted than we else should be to recognize the truths of the Bible, as well in their substance as in their far-reaching compass, scope, and power of adaptation. Thus we are in a higher measure prepared to exhibit them, with all the great verities pertaining to humanity, in a form at once consonant with science, and befitting their essence and intrinsic worth. And this is not, what some might suppose, an explaining away of the spirituality of the Divine Word. While the unfathomable depths of the truth are recognized, this is simply an effort to bring it out and make it avail-

ing to the fullest extent possible, under the circumstances; to educe it, as it was intended to be educed, through the manifold means and agencies that the works of creation suggest and supply. This being the case, it is evident that Geology may be made ancillary to the pulpit. A student of the Bible, who is also a student of Nature, is to just this extent better fitted to be a preacher of the Gospel. With a thorough knowledge of the world of order and beauty around him, he is prepared to understand the phraseology of the Word of Life, to enter more deeply than he otherwise would into its spiritual import, to draw out its treasures more exhaustively; to exhibit them in closer consonance with the natural sciences, with which most have some acquaintance, to solve the difficulties and perplexities, which are perpetually arising from this source in the minds of his hearers; and thus, in presenting the Gospel, to meet the reasonable demands and necessities of the age. Accordingly, the study of Geology, though it never be mentioned by name, may add untold power to the pulpit; help it to become, what it was intended to be, not merely a thing of the past, but a living centre of light and influence, an existing means of dispelling darkness, a present aid in the upbuilding of souls in holiness.<sup>1</sup> Now, if there be such a process in operation, it can scarcely fail to elevate and ennoble the whole man; and not him alone, or the character of the pulpit merely; it will tend to reach the entire community, to spread from nation to nation, and thus to affect the literature of each and of every people that yields to its sway. Working in this wise like leaven, it creates a wide demand, and prompts to its supply. It raises the received standard of literary excellence; so it affords help toward its realization under appropriate forms; it also prepares the way for its generous appreciation. As literature is the choice expression of the life of a people, under the glowing forms of the intellect, as kindled by the heart, and guided by the creative imagination, the higher the life is the nobler and the more lofty will it be in all its varied utterances. The influence of such studies will, likewise, appear in elevating the recognized standard of the fine arts, in furnishing aid toward the embodiment of man's nobler conceptions, in cultivating a taste for masterpieces of ideal per-

<sup>1</sup> This suggests a want, which, so far as we are aware, still remains largely unsupplied, in our Theological Seminaries. In our judgment, each school for theological training needs, in addition to its ordinary appliances, a distinct department, which shall have as its aim the thorough and exhaustive exhibition of the relations of the natural sciences, and especially of Geology, to the Bible. A *comparative* department of this kind, well manned, promises to do for Christianity and the churches a work which now, alas! is left for the most part undone; it might prepare the clergyman to meet and influence a large class in society which is not likely to be reached by existing methods; it would tend to free our churches from a lurking infidelity which, like a dry-rot, is working ruin in the temple of the Lord. "Verily, we speak that we do know."

fection, and leading to their due appreciation. The arts of design being the comely exhibition of the finest ideals in marble, in lines and colors, in rhythm, in melody, and in music, they will in all likelihood be elevated and advanced, give evidence of comprehensive insight, of justness and delicacy of conception, of refinement and discriminating skill in execution, in just the proportion the mind and heart are made genial, noble, and free by the presence of truth in its higher and spiritual aspects.

Finally, it may be observed that the study of Geology promises to be of immense practical value. This is eminently true in a comparatively low and material sense of the word "practical." It holds equally, and is calculated as we advance to become more and more true, under a far higher and worthier aspect of the matter. When such results as those just noticed are secured, or if they be in a way to be made ours in a constantly advancing degree, a vast influence, as we see at a glance, will be exerted upon us vitally, and therefore practically. We shall be led almost unawares to manifest, under active relations, thus to reduce to practice, and so both to realize in ourselves, and to exhibit under the manifold relations of life, that which comes in this way to animate our wills, to enlighten our understandings, and to warm our hearts. These nobler views, all this knowledge, insight, and power, will become living and working principles, therefore practical realities, in our souls. And they will evince their active presence, and show their prevailing might, not only in our character, not merely in our modes of thinking and feeling, but also and by no means least in our outward relations. While ennobled by them spiritually, we shall be led, under their genial sway, to have more comforts of a domestic kind, a larger share of the amenities of life, with more abundant and better opportunities for all varieties of social and intellectual, of literary and artistic, of moral and religious improvement. In short, we shall have thrown around us, as we are striving to draw about our fellows and ourselves, in larger profusion those very objects and influences which tend, and, as cherished, are sure, to raise the man above the bondage of nature, and establish him in rational freedom, with rightful control over all the lower forms of creation. Gaining a profound insight into the world around us, we shall secure an intelligent dominion over it, and become masters even of our own nature. Doing this, while we yield ourselves to the Divine Spirit, we shall be guided into all the truth; at the same time we shall be practically taught rightly to regulate our various powers of body, mind, and heart, and so to use as not to abuse the manifold precious gifts bestowed upon us, in unstinted bounty, by an all-wise Creator, our ever-gracious Father.

JOHN B. PERRY.



## A

## DISQUISITION

Concerning

## Ecclesiastical Councils.

[Continued from page 32.]

AN *Ecclesiastical Council*, or *Synod*, is a Convention of duly qualified Persons, called to Consult, and judge about Affairs, in which Churches, one or more are concerned. There have been great Disputes on that Question, *Who has Power to Convoke a Synod?* Whether it belongs to Magistrates, or to Pastors. I shall not insist upon that Enquiry, only say, that if we keep to Scripture, Churches have this Power Belonging to them. There have likewise been some who have decried *all Ecclesiastical Councils* as useless, [2] nay, pernicious; and as having always done hurt to the Interest of Religion. *Nazianzen's* (a) Expressions Concerning this, are famously known. *Bellarmino* Charges *Luther* with being of that Opinion, but he wrongs him. If *Luther* was against all Councils, why does *Bellarmino* complain of his being *President* of a Council, Convened at *Wittenberg*, in the Year 1536. in which there were (as he says) *Three Hundred Pastors*. I know not of one Protestant Writer of any Fame, that dislikes all *Synods*, *Grotius* only Excepted: It cannot be denied, but that the greatest part of Ecclesiastical *Convocations*, have done more against the Truth than for it, as any man that Consults *Aisted's* Chronology of Councils, will easily perceive. But this has proceeded not from the nature of Councils, but from the faultiness of the Persons, of whom they were Constituted. The greatest part of Magistrates, and of Ministers, and of Professed Christians have been Erroneous and Vicious. This [3] ought not to prejudice Men against Magistracy, and Ministry, and Christianity. The same is to be affirmed of Synods, of which also there have been more than a few that have been blessed for the Suppression of Errors, and Establishment of the Churches in the Truth. Several Particular and Provincial Synods have given a faithful Testimony against Errors, both in Judgment and Practice. Writers inform us, that (c) *The first Ecclesiastical Council*, after

(a) in *Epist. ad Procopium*.(b) in *Chronol. Cap. 36*.(c) *Eachard. Eccles. History, p. 343*.

that held at *Ferusalem*, was in the year 180. in which the Herefy of *Montanus*, and his Followers was Condemn'd. There was a Synod in *Arabia*. *A. D.* 240. In which *Origen* was the Prefident. This Synod Condemned Soul-sleepers. That in *Arabia*, *A. D.* 260. did good Service for the Churches, in Refuting and Condemning the Hæresies of *Paul* of *Samofata*, and the *Paulinites*, as they were Called. And the four *Oecuminal* Councils (altho' as *Calvin*, and many others have observed) we cannot say that any one of them was [4] altogether free from Error in some lesser points, were blessed for the Suppressing of the Hæresies, which did infest the Church in those Ages. The *Nicene* Synod, in which there were 318 *Bishops*, or *Pastors*, besides a numerous Company of Elders, and others whom the Emperour himself, the great *Constantine* honoured with his Presence, Condemned the Herefy of *Arius*. This has been Esteemed the most Celebrious Synod that ever was in the World. 2. The first General Council at *Constantinople*, in which there were an hundred and fifty Pastors, Condemned the Herefy of *Macedonius*. 3. In the great *Ephefine* Synod, there were two hundred Pastors, in which the Herefy of *Nestorius*, who maintained that Christ is two Persons, was Condemned. This Synod Convened, *A. D.* 431. In this very City of *Ephefus*, there was another Synod, though not a general one) held but nineteen years after the first; in which an Heretical Error on the other Extream was Established, and several Members of the Synod Compelled by Tortures to Subscribe the Decrees of the Majority. In [5] so short a time have Synods in the same place, greatly varied from one another. 4. In the General Synod at *Chalcedon*, *A. D.* 451. there was 630 Pastors, besides Presbyters and Laymen, as they are called: This Synod was of great use in Confuting and Condemning the Herefy of *Eutyches*, who held that there was but one Nature belonging to our Saviour Christ; it appears by these mentioned, that notwithstanding Councils are not infallible, nevertheless, they have been very helpful to discover the Truth, and settle the Churches in the profession of it. They are necessary, tho' not absolutely to the *Being*, yet to the *Well-being* of Churches. I have said nothing of the *Synods* which have been among the *Reformed*, in these latter Ages, in *France* and *Holland*, and in other Countries, by some of which the Interest of the true Religion has been a great gainer. It has been Objected by some, *Where have we an Institution for Synods?* We answer, that the Light of Nature directs unto it: *Plus vident Oculi, quam Oculus*. Many Eyes see more than one. The Scripture says, *Where no Counsel is the* [6] *People fall, but in the multitude of Counsellors there is safety.* Prov. 11. 14. And therefore they that are wise, will in their difficulties ask for Counsel. 2 Sam. 20. 18. *They were wont to speak in old time, saying, they shall surely ask*

*Counsel at Abel ; and so they ended the Matter.* Moreover, we have Scripture Example for a Synod. The Church in *Antioch*, and that at *Ferusalem*, under the Conduct of the Apostles, Convened in order to Consulting on a Question, which was of common Concernment to them. Dr Owen (d) therefore rightly observes, *That Synods are Consecrated to the use of the Church in all Ages, by the Example of the Apostles, in their guidance of the first Churches of Jews and Gentiles, which had the force of a Divine Institution, as being by them under the Conduct of the Holy Spirit.*

These things being premised, I proceed to what I have principally designed in this *Disquisition*. There are two *Problems* relating to *Ecclesiastical Councils*, which I have been desired to Express my Thoughts and Judgment con[7]cerning them. One of the Questions is,

*Whether no Acts of Councils are to be received as Concluding and Decisive, for which there is not the Concurrence of the Major part of the Pastors therein Concerned ?*

The Affirmative I can in no wise Concur with. I may suppose, that I have as much reason to know what has been the practice of these Churches, as most Men now alive ; having been (however unworthy) in the Teaching Office among them for more than two and fifty years ; (which so far as I understand, no other Minister now in *New-England* has) and assisting in many Councils of the Churches, in which I never knew but that the Concurrence of the Major part of the Delegates was Decisive : Nor was it ever declared, that one half of the Pastors in Synods should have a Negative on the whole Council ; nor Asserted, That Pastors have a greater Authority than *Ruling Elders*, which is implied in the Question under Consideration. Shall we affirm, that if there should be a Council, consisting of ten Pastors, and ten *Ruling* [8] *Elders*, and twenty Brethren, that if five of these Pastors perhaps un-studied, Unexperienced Young Men did not Concur, notwithstanding the other five Pastors, Men of the greatest Learning and Gravity, and all the ten *Ruling Elders*, and the twenty Brethren fully Concurred, yet that the Act of the Council shall be no Act at all, because the five Young Pastors did not Approve of it ; But this also is implied in the Question. My further Reason for Non-concurrence therewith are these.

1. In the Synod at *Ferusalem* (the first and only Council of Churches mentioned in the Scripture) The Pastors there did not Assume to themselves a Negative over the other Messengers ; therefore neither ought it to be so now. It is clear, that not only Elders, but Brethren acted in that Council ; and that Brethren, and not Pastors only should be sent to Synods, is acknowledged by us all. It has been disputed between *Prot-*

(d) *Of Gospel Churches.* p. 252.

*eslants* and *Papists*, whether the Brethren, or Pastors only have a definitive Suffrage in Synods. *Papists* are for Pastors only, and [9] so are our *Prelatical* Writers ; one of them lately giveth it for the definition of a Synod, *That it is an Assembly of the Hierarchical Order in Consult for the Conduct of the Churches.* But our most Eminent Protestant Divines maintain, that Ruling Elders and Brethren have equally a definitive Voice with the other ; and this they prove, because it was so in the Synod at *Ferusalem*, they argue strongly ; Why was the Cause brought to the Brethren, and not to the Pastors only if they had not power to judge and to determine concerning the Question before them ? The Decrees of that Synod were sent to the Churches *in the name of the Brethren*, as well as of the *Apostles and Elders*. Acts 15. 22. *It pleased the Apostles and Elders, with the whole Church to send Chosen Men ;* and ver. 23. They wrote Letters by them after this manner ; *The Apostles, and Elders, and Brethren, send greeting ;* and ver. 25. *It seemed good to us, viz. Brethren as well as Elders ;* and ver. 28. *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay no greater burden than these necessary things.* The Council at *Basil* would not admit of [10] the *Pope's* Superiority over the whole Council, as if the Council could not make a Valid Act, if the *Pretended Pastor* over all the Churches did not Concur ; and they reasoned thus, (as I find our Protestant Divines have done) that word *Edoxe*, which is translated, *it pleased*, or *it seemed good to us* (which word is used three times by the Synod at *Ferusalem*) being spoken not of Pastors only, but of others also ; it does evidently import, that those others, *viz. the Brethren* in the Assembly had a Power of Judgment and Determination in the Question under debate. They in whose Names the Synodal Decrees were sent to the Churches, had undoubtedly a suffrage, and the right of a definitive Sentence in them. But this was done in the name of the *Brethren*, as well as of the Pastors. Now then, if the major Part of all those who have in common the power of a definitive Sentence Concurr, the Act of the Council is Valid, and ought to be decisive. It has been objected, that in Acts 16. 4. 'tis said, that the Synodal Decrees *were ordained by the Apostles and Elders*, without any mention of [11] the Brethren, therefore it may seem that the Brethren had not a Vote therein. To this both Dr. *Whitaker*, and our Learned *Parker* (e) Reply, that by a *Synechdoche* (very usual in the Scripture) the Apostles and Elders, being a chief part of the Assembly, are put for the whole, the Brethren being included, and are expressly mentioned in the former Chapter. It is past doubt that the Question was brought to the Multitude, Acts 15. 12, 13. (Gr. *Plethos unde Plebs*) and they had their part in disputing and discussing the Question then to be decided. Dr.

(e) *De Polit. Eccles. Cap. 22. p. 396.*

Owen (f) speaks the truth, when he says, that it is not necessary that Pastors only should be delegated by the Churches, *but may have others joyned with them*; and had so, until Prelatick Usurpation overturned their Liberties; therefore there were others besides Paul and Barnabas sent from Antioch to Jerusalem, and the Brethren of the Church (says the Doctor) *whatever is impudently pretended to the contrary, [12] Concurred in the Decree and Determination there made.* I suppose there are no Ministers in New-England, excepting a Conformist or two, but what is in this, of Dr. Owen's Judgment; yet there are some in the World will be ready to say, Dr. Owen was indeed a Man of great Learning, but he was an *Independent*, and wrote like himself; But Dr. Whitaker Lived before the Name of *Presbyterian* and *Independent* was heard of; yet he speaks in an higher strain than the other Doctor has done. This Doctor (g) speaking of the Synod at *Jerusalem*, has these words, *In hoc concilio quivis Laicus et Presbyter definitivum suffragium habuit, non minus quam Petrus.* In this Council (says he) *Every Laick and Presbyter had a definitive Suffrage no less than Peter.* This was Dr. Whitaker's Judgment; a Man of whom it was said, that he was the Oracle of the Univerfity, and the Miracle of the World.

2. When Pastors of Churches Convene in Synods, it is not their Pastoral Office, but the Churches delegation, which gives them a right to be there. It was once disputed, whether the Bishops have not a Negative on the House of Lords, so that there can be no Valid Act of Parliament without their Concurrence. Mr. *Bashaw*, (a Learned Lawyer) proved they had not; because they did not Sit there by virtue of their Office, but of the *Baronies* which belonged to them. If then Pastors do not Sit in Council as Officers, but as Messengers deputed by their Churches, they may not Claim a *Negative*. They would have no right to be in this or that Synod, if their Churches did not send them. True it is, when a Council is Called for, the Churches ought to send their Pastors, for they should be, and often are, most able to Judge in Ecclesiastical Affairs. The words in our Platform are these: *Because none are, or should be more fit to know the State of the Churches, nor to advise of ways for the good thereof, than Elders; therefore it is fit in the Choice of Messengers for such Assemblies, they have special respect to such.* Never-[14]theless, they do not Sit there as Pastors, Officers, Rulers. Dr. Owen speaks Judiciously, and like himself in saying, *That no Persons by virtue of any Office meerly, have right to be Members of Ecclesiastical Synods as such; neither is there Example or Reason to give colour to any such pretence: Officers of the Church ought to be present in them, but meerly as such, it belongs not to them.* They who say, this is pure *Independent*

(f) *Ubi supra* p. 263.(g) *De Consilijis Quest.* 3. Cap. 3. p. 97.

*Doctrine*, discover their own ignorance ; for *Bullinger*, *Hyperius*, *Daneus*, *Voetius*, *Vedelius*, and *Zeperus*, who were no Independents, have said as much as this amounts unto, which I have in another Discourse taken notice of. And hence it does not follow, that if Elders have a Negative Voice in their Particular Churches, which our Platform of Discipline gives them ; *Chap. 10 Sect. 11.* that they have so in Councils, because in their Particular Churches they are Rulers, to whom Obedience is due. *Heb. 13. 17.* But in Synods they have no power of Rule. A Pastor when Sitting in Council, acts as a Church Messenger, and not as a Church Officer ; the Church does not [15] give more power to one of their Messengers, than to another, a *Presbyter*, a *Deacon*, a *Brother* Sitting in the Synod is a Publick Person and Representative of the Church, as well as the *Pastor*. When a City sends to the Convention of the Nation a *Senatour*, and another who is not Vested with any Civil Authority, to be their Representatives, their Power in the Great Council of the Nation is Equal ; tho' when they are in their own City, one has a greater Rule and Authority than the other. *Qui* (says our famous *Parker*, p. 391 and Dr. *Whitaker*) *Ab Ecclesijs pariter delegantur, Pares esse debent.* Why should there not be a *Parity* in the *Power*, when there is a *Parity* in the *Delegation* ? there is great Reason for it, Considering that some Brethren who are sent to Councils, are as able, and it may be, far more able to give Light concerning the Question to be discussed, than any Pastor there. In the famous *Nicene Synod*, the Great *Athanasius* was not then a Pastor, (Bishops have appropriated that name to themselves.) But a *Deacon* in the [16] Church of *Alexandria*. But what Pastor (of which there were more than 300 in that Council) did so much Service for the Truth, in opposition to the *Arian Herefy*, as *Athanasius* did ? who notwithstanding his being but a *Deacon*, was a great part of that Assembly. In the Synod at *Dort*, almost an Hundred years since, some of the *Seniors* (as they call their *Ruling Elders*) did as *Voetius* (who was a Member of that Synod) testifies more Service for the Truth against the *Arminian Remonstrants*, than some of their Pastors did. We have seen in several of our own Churches, Brethren of far greater Learning and Abilities, than their Pastors. And since the *power of Synods is only Consultative*, what good reason can there be given, why such should not have an Equal Vote with any other ? *Si paria aut majora in Laicis dona relucant, Car non adhiberentur in Concilio Ecclesiastico ?* says *Bullinger* ; (\*) If *Laicks* have Equal, or it may be, greater Gifts than Bishops, why should not their Votes in Synods be of [17] Equal Authority with others ? It is past doubt, (as we shall further shew) that in the Ancient Councils there were *Brethren as well as Pastors*, and that the *Decision of*

\* *Bullinger de Consilij cap. 2. p. 137.*

the *Question* was brought before them also, which implies an Equality of Power in their Suffrages. It has been objected, that this Principle will make way for Ignorant *Mechanicks* to Carry it in Synods against their Learned Pastors. The Jesuit *Saunders* raveth at the *Centuriators*, because they affirmed, (and most truly) that in the Primitive Churches, others besides Clergy-Men were Members in Synods: He says, that none but Mad-men will believe that *Mechanicks* should Sit in Council with *Bishops*, about Ecclesiastical Affairs. But why not? As for the name of *Mechanicks*, altho' it is Contemptible with us, it is not so in all Nations. It was not so among the *Jews*. The most Learned *Rabbi's* have not thought themselves dishonoured by Learning (i) a Trade. In their Writings we read of *Rabbi Jose*, a Skinner; *Rabbi John* a [18] Shoemaker; *Rabbi Jude* a Baker, *Rabbi Meir* a Scrivener. And we know that the Apostle *Paul*, notwithstanding his being a great Scholar, had learned to be a Tent-maker; and *Aquila*, a man mighty in the Scriptures, was of the same Craft. *Acts* 18. 3. It was frequent among the Ministers of *Bohemia*, to be well skilled in some *Mechanical Operations*. It is not then enough to Unqualify a Man for a Synod, that he is a *Mechanick*; Nor are any Ministers among us (altho' Prelatists are) of that Opinion: Nor have I written this, as if I thought *Every Brother* in a Church, were fit to be Chosen a Member of a Council. Churches ought to be careful in that matter. If they send Ignorant and Unqualified Persons to be their *Delegates*, the fault is in the Church that does so, and not in the Principle, that has been maintained. The Judicious Author of a little Book, with the Title of, *Puritanismus Anglicanus*, affirms, that it is no disparagement to a Church, if some who *Exercise Mechanick Arts*, are Chosen Ruling Elders therein, provided they are Men of Understanding, and of Exem[19]plary Piety. Then why may not such be Delegates of Churches. I shall further add, that there are *Mechanicks*, who altho' they do not Excel in that which is called *Humane Learning*, they are well Versed and Learned in the Scriptures, spending much time in Consulting those Oracles of God, and being Men of great Piety, and Excellent Natural Accomplishments, they may be very Useful in Synods. Ecclesiastical Historians, give a Remarkable Account of what happened in the *Nicene Synod*. A Pious Old Man, who was no Clergy-Man, nor Exercised in Philosophical Notions, by his plain discourse did more towards the Conviction of an Heretical Philosopher, than all the Learned Bishops in the Council could do.

3. *Popery* came in at this door, of Pastors assuming more to themselves than belongs to them, and the Fraternities readiness to part with what was theirs. The Famous Author of the History of the Council of

(i) *Du veil. in Acts* 9. 43.



*Trent*, notwithstanding his being a Papist, has Asserted as much as this comes to. Pastors did not at first pretend unto a *sole Authority*, nor yet unto a *Negative* [20] in Synods, *from the Beginning it was not so*; nor yet in the days of *Cyprian* (k) (who flourished *A. D.* 250.) Presbyters, Deacons, and other People were in his Synod; and yet forty years before him *Origen* (l) complained of *Episcopal Encroachments* then beginning. In a Synod which Convened at *Rome*, by which *Novatus* was Condemned, there were many Presbyters and Deacons. That Elders and Brethren, as well as Pastors, had in those days their Interest in *Ecclesiastical Councils*, is so manifest, that a late *Episcopalian* cannot deny it; For in the year 270. there was a Synod Convened at *Antioch*, to Compose the Troubles there raised by their Bishop *Paul*; In this Synod were seventy two Bishops or Pastors. After they had Condemned the Heretic *Paul*, for his Immorality, as well as Heterodoxy, they gave an account of their proceedings in a Synodical Letter, directed to the then Bishop of [21] *Rome*, and to others (m) *which Letter was written not only in the Name of the Bishops, but also of the Presbyters, Deacons and Laity*, says Mr. *Echard*. And in some of the *General Councils*, there were not only Pastors, but Elders and Laymen too (as they call them) who had their Suffrage in them. So it was in the *Nicene Synod*: *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, who were not Pastors but Elders of the Church then in *Rome*, signed the Acts of that Council; and in that of *Chalcedon* there were many Laicks. I know Papists and Prelates deny this, but the Testimony of *Socrates* and *Eusebius*, and others, have sufficiently proved it. Notwithstanding the Mystery of Iniquity began to work betimes; It was a considerable time before Bishops did *Monopolize* all Synodal Power. The Usurpation came in gradually, until at last none but *Bishops*, who called themselves *Pastors*, were thought worthy to be Members Constituent of *Ecclesiastical Councils*, and of these there were sometimes [22] more than a good many. *Bellarmino* tells of a Council, (which he will have to be his *tenth* (n) General one) in which there were no less than a thousand Bishops. I mention not these things to reflect on any, only Considering that Good and Faithful Pastors in the more Primitive Times, did unawares give a step toward Popery; we should be watchful against any thing that may have the least Aspect that way. The Pastors in the Council at *Nice* (o) giving the precedency to the Bishop of *Rome*, was a fatal thing. Before that was done, the Church of *Rome* (saith *Aeneas Sylvius*) had but little Respect.

(k) *Lib.* 3. *Cap.* 10. *has these words, Presente plebis maxima parte.*

(l) *Exod. Homill.* 11.

(m) See Mr. *Echard's Ecclesiastical History.* p. 432. (n) *Concilium Lateranense.*

(p) *Nicenum Concilium sedem Metricis qua super septem montes sedet præparavit.*

v. *Parker pol. Lib.* p. 269.

4. The Affirmative does not agree with the Doctrine of the most Reformed Churches at this day, Whether Presbyterian or Congregational; If it had been thus Expressed, no Act of the Council shall be decisive without the major part of the *Elders*, it had been [23] (tho' not justifiable) yet less Exceptionable. But as it is now Expressed, it makes *Ruling Elders*, as well as *Brethren* in Councils to signifie very Little. When the Scripture informs us that the Synodal Decrees of the Council at *Jerusalem* were Consented to by the *Elders*; our incomparable *Parker* observes, that *Ruling*, as well as *Teaching Elders* were Comprehended under that Expression. A *Ruling Elder* has not that *Doctrinal Authority*, which a *Pastor* has; nevertheless his *Ruling Authority* is Equal with the *Pastors*; and when as Delegates they Sit in Synods, may have an Equal Power. Hence *Sutliff*, (a Prelatick Protestant) complains that the Synods of the Reformed Churches send two *Ruling Elders* for one *Pastor*, and so (says he) the major part Carries it against their *Pastors*. Under the Reforming Parliament in *England*, there was a Presbyterian Provincial Synod, settled at *London* (p) Consisting of twelve Ministers, and twenty four *Lay-Elders*, (as they were cal[24]led) Acts to be Valid which pass by the Major part. Sir *B. Whitlock*, in his Memorials, p. 23. informs us, that in the year 1638. It was Determined in *Scotland*, that every Parish should send a *Lay-man*, whom they called a *Ruling Elder*, to their National Synod, which should have Equal Power with the Minister. The Reverend Mr. *Walter Stuart*, in his Collections concerning the Discipline and Government of the Church in *Scotland*, informs us, that their *General Assembly* Consists of *Pastors* and *Ruling Elders*; and that in the beginning of the Reformation, the Number of *Pastors* were but the fourth part of the Assembly. Their *Ruling Elders* are not Ordained with Imposition of Hands. He says, that the Assembly is Null where no *Ruling Elders* are Commissioned. He takes notice, that by the directions of the *English* Parliament, August 19. 1545. it is provided, that there be in all Assemblies a *Ruling Elder*, and one Minister. In the Ecclesiastical Discipline of the Reformed Churches in *France*, 'tis declared, that in their Provincial Synods, the *Pastor* shall bring one or two El[25]ders with him; and that if he Comes alone, he shall not be regarded; that the President in the Synod shall gather the Votes of every Particular, and declare the Major part; and that *Elders* deputed by the Churches, shall have their Votes as the *Pastors*. v. Chap. 8. p. 26, 27. So that in a Presbyterian Synod, an Act may be valid, altho' the major part of the *Pastors* do not Concur; nay, tho' not one *Pastor* does Concur in the Passing of it. Was not the National *Kirk* Assembly in *Scotland* lately Over-ruled by the *Ruling Elders* therein. As

(p) See the History of the Four Last Reigns. p. 159.

for *Congregationalists* they Concur with Mr. Parker, Dr. Whitaker, Dr. Voet, and Dr. Owen; that the Power which the Pastors have in Synods, is not meerly from their Office, but from the Mission they receive from their Churches; and consequently that there is a parity in the Power: And with this agrees our *Platform of Church Discipline*, which makes the next Efficient Cause of Synods to be the Missive Power of the Churches, and speaks of the Churches sending their *Elders* and other *Messengers*; which supposes that Elders in Synods are Considered as [26] *Messengers*, and not as *Officers*; and that *Synods may not Exercise any Church Authority*, which, if they Sat there under the notion of being Vested with Office-Power might be done. And that this was formerly the Judgment of Ministers in *New-England*, we may Conclude from M. Hooker's *Survey of Church-Discipline*, which had the Approbation of the Pastors then at *New-Haven, Guilford, Milford, Stratford, Fairfield*, and many others. Now Mr. Hooker (g) asserts, *That in Synods all have Equal Power, because equally Sent and Chosen; and that none aē there as Officers, i. e. tho' they be Officers in their own Congregations, they are not so here, but as Called. Here is no Aē of an Officer, because the formal reason of his being a Member of the Synod, is the Chusing and Sending. And therefore they that are no Officers if so Chosen, have a right to Vote; and therefore they that are Officers, if not Sent, have no right of Voting. Those Aēls which proceed in Common from Men without, as well as in Office, those [27] cannot be Aēls of Men in Office, when as all Aēls of the Synod are performed by all the Members of the Synod, by Brethren as well as Elders.* Thus speaks our Renowned Hooker. Nor do his Sentiments differ from Polanus † who maintains, that all who are delegated from the Churches, has a Decisive Vote, and that Masters of Schools, and others, who are not Pastors, may be Elected. The *Tripert History* testifies, that there were *Laicks* in the *Nicene Council*.

It has been Objected, that Mr. Cotton maintains, (r) that in the Synod of *Jerusalem*, the Authority of the Decrees say chiefly, if not only, in the *Apostles* and *Elders*. Some I hear have laid great weight upon this. I shall a little Consider it. 1. Why should we be, *Additū in verba ullius Jurare Magistri*? Why should we Call any Man Master? *Mat. 23. 12.* The Schol-men will now and then say of their admired Master, *Peter Lombard, Hic Magister non tenetur.* [28] Here we must Crave Leave to Dissent from our Master. So if Mr. Cotton has happened to drop a Notion, which does not well Suit with *Congregational Principles*, which we take to be according to the Scripture, we are not bound to write after him. If the Opinion of Men were to decide the

(g) *Survey Part 4, p. 47, 48, 52.*(†) *Polan. Syntag. Theol. Lib. 7. Cap. 14.*(r) *In his Book of the Keys. p. 26.*

Question, there is as much reason to submit to Dr. Ames as to any Man ; who says, that others besides Pastors may have *Authority* in Ecclesiastical Councils, which is contrary to saying Pastors *only* have Authority. 2. Let his words be taken in a right sense, and I shall say as my Venerable Father Cotton does. But there is an Ambiguity in the word *Authority*. Sometimes it is taken for a Power of *Rule* and *Jurisdiction*. A Negative Voice implies no less. No Conventions are said to have Authority in a strict sense, or a Power to impose their Acts on others, but such as have a *Juridical Power*. This cannot be Mr. Cotton's Meaning. For all *Congregationalists* (of whom he was not the least) deny that Synods have any such Power. This we see in the Order of the [29] *Congregational Churches* (*f*) Published in 1658. Our *New-England Platform* declares, that a Synod cannot Exercise any *Act of Authority*. The Presidential Synod, *Acts* 15. (they say) did not. The Scripture (saith my Learned Tutor, Mr. Norton (*t*) *does neither Expressly, nor by just Consequence mention Synodical Authority. When the Power of Synods is Called Authority, the Expression is improper, their Power is only Decisive, not Authoritative, i. e. Juridical.* This he insists on, and proves by Arguments not easy to be answered. Which is also done by Dr. Goodwin (*u*) and by my Father. (*w*) In the Private Colloquies among the Churches in *France*, they allow Elders and Deacons to propose their Opinions ; but (say they) *the Decision of the Doctrine, is principally reserved to the Pastors, and to Doctors in Divinity.* It is rational, that it should be so, others being not ordina[30]rily capable to Judge in abstruse Controversy. There is a Divine Authority belonging to Pastors. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. I suppose Mr. Cotton intended no more than this, that if the Brethren in the Council at *Jerusalem* had Concurred in their Advice, if all the Elders and Apostles had not Concurred with them, their Decrees would have had little or no Authority. And who will say otherwise? Mr. Norton in his Catechism, has this Question, *What is the Power of a Council?* Answ. To declare the Truth, not to Exercise Authority. Nevertheless, in his Answer to *Apollony*, p. 118. He proves that the Sentence of a Council is to be Decisive. 3. The words in the Question very much differ from Mr. Cotton's Assertion. For he mentions *Elders*, when as the Question speaks of *Pastors* only, which has a Prelatick Aspect. He allows as much Authority to Ruling Elders in Synods, as to Pastors, which the Question as Expressed does not do, but is Exclusive as to their having a *Negative* on the Acts of the Council. 4. Mr. Cotton speaks of Apostolical Authority. The Power of the Apo[31]stles was greater than ordinary Pastors may pretend unto.

(f) *Thef.* 26.(u) *Of Church-Government.*(t) *Respons. ad Apollon. Cap. 10. p. 110, 111.*(w) *In his Answer to Mr. Rutherford.*

## PRAYER AND THE PROMISES.

PRAYER answered is a mystery to the philosopher. Prayer unanswered is a mystery to the Christian. The Scriptures affirm the efficacy of prayer, even to the very things prayed for, but how seldom is it so answered that the answer can be recognized! Herein is a difficulty. It is not a difficulty suggested by modern scepticism, but has always prevailed in the Church. Most persons who have had special occasion to pray earnestly and importunately can testify out of their own painful experience, in the words of Jeremiah, "When I cry and shout he shutteth out my prayer."

The difficulty, in brief statement, is this: the word of God seems to promise more to prayer than is performed; in other words, Christian experience and observation do not accord with the explicitness and fullness of the promises made to prayer. To explain this discrepancy, and vindicate the Divine veracity and faithfulness, is the object of this brief article.

It may be well, first, to notice some of the theories of explanation as they lie in the popular mind and find frequent expression both oral and written. If they seem trivial or irrational to any, it should be borne in mind that erroneous views of prayer are detrimental to Christian character and usefulness, and an effort to correct them, if successful, cannot be unimportant.

## SINCERE PRAYER.

The difficulty under consideration is by some supposed to be reconciled by regarding prayer as of various degrees of sincerity, and by affirming that all perfectly *sincere prayer* is answered. Is it so?

Did not King David offer sincere prayer when he fasted and lay all night upon the earth praying for the life of his child? Are not those prayers sincere which are offered through a sorrowful life?—some for a husband going downward to the drunkard's grave; some for a prodigal son still wandering in lands unknown; some for the loved one toward whom death is stealthily approaching.

## IMPORTUNATE PRAYER.

But it is sometimes affirmed that prayer would always be effectual if it were persistent and *importunate*. Doubtless Christ by the parable of the unjust judge meant to authorize and encourage persevering and importunate prayer. But it is too obvious that such prayer is not always effectual. Leaving out of view other and indispensable conditions of effectual prayer, it may come to be but little more than vain repetition, or the prayer of

much speaking, which Christ condemns. Importunity legitimately arises out of heavy burdens, such as the prophet bore when he exclaimed, "O that my head were waters and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people." Or such as the distressed patriarch felt when he wrestled with God until the breaking of the day, saying, "I will not let thee go except thou bless me." But even such importunity as this may be denied, except it be put forth in the true spirit of prayer.

#### BELIEVING PRAYER.

By another theory of explanation it is claimed that all *believing* prayer is answered. If the word "believing" be taken in its fullest sense, there is some ground for the assumption. Faith is sometimes used to denote the whole of religion. So "believe" has sometimes an equivalent signification. Taken in this sense, it might perhaps be said that all believing prayer is answered. But it is to be feared that belief, in this connection, is often merely an act of the intellect. Consequently, we are sometimes pained to hear prayer offered under this delusion,—the mind laboring and taking on a sort of forced agony to believe that the answer is at hand, when there is present to the mind no good reason whatever to expect it. A spasmodic attempt to believe usurps the place of deep moral conviction.

#### THE PRAYER OF FAITH,

So called, is only another name for believing prayer. But under this designation the subject has been discussed by certain earnest, godly men, and conclusions reached which seem to be open to criticism. They claim that faith, in connection with a godly life, is the all-sufficient prerequisite of prevailing prayer. With this proposition little fault can be found. But in applying this theory, it seems that an unjustifiable stress is laid on the term *faith*. It is treated as something separable from the godly life,—as a power by itself, which the godly are privileged to exercise, and may by a distinct effort wield with a mighty effect. But if the faith in question be true faith,—the "faith which trusts in God's character and declarations, with an unreserved surrender of the will to his guidance,"—it cannot be so separated from the godly life and invested with a potency of its own. And the godly soul, in the act of prayer, gains nothing by a passionate endeavor after faith. Its faith can be neither more nor less than the measure of its godliness. It is also implied in this view that effectual prayer for specific objects may be offered, right here and now, as the privilege of every good man. Some exceptions, however, seem to have been necessary in regard to the proper objects of prayer. The conversion of the entire world to God, it is said, is one of the objects which is not within the range of effectual prayer, because it is not the revealed will of God that all men

should be saved. This certainly has the appearance of forcing the truth to fit the hypothesis. Would it not be better to admit that in the godly life of most men there is some imperfection which vitiates the conditions under which prayer never fails of its object?

#### PRAYER FOR SPIRITUAL BLESSINGS.

Another method of explanation, which is thought to relieve the difficulty in some measure, lies in a distinction between prayer for temporal and spiritual objects. The latter, it is said, never fails, and those unlimited promises are thus far fulfilled.

Doubtless sincere prayer for spiritual blessings is more sure of its answer than prayer for specific temporal things. But is such prayer surely and always answered? It would be a spiritual blessing to attain to perfect sanctification in a moment, and all the remainder of life be sinless. This prayer is in fact frequently offered, — “make us holy as thou art holy”; and yet no visible sign of the answer is noticeable in the life that follows.

#### THE FAITH OF MIRACLES.

The only theory of this class that remains to be considered is worthy of a more extended notice, because it has been adopted by many professed expounders of divine truth. It is this: those unlimited promises of the Scriptures to prayer were restricted in their application to such as wrought miracles. This assumes, I think without sufficient evidence, that miracles were wrought through prayer which was energized by a peculiar faith. Thus two kinds of faith are implied, and by some distinctly advocated; the one, that which is common to all Christians; the other a different one, — different at least in degree, — a faith far purer and deeper than enters into common Christian experience. This they call “the faith of miracles.” Now, bearing in mind that no true faith can exist irrespective of character, — that the faith which comes of a holy life must enter into the prayer which “moves the hand” that “moves the world,” it should be shown upon this view, that all who have exercised the gift of miracles (perhaps not excepting the magicians of Egypt, the Witch of Endor, nor Balaam the greedy prophet) have possessed in a supereminent degree those moral qualities on which this truer and deeper faith is constituted. We need not say that the persons referred to enjoyed no such pre-eminence. Nor does it appear that in the age of miracles those who enjoyed this honor were conspicuous above others in true piety. They seem to have had like passions with other sinful men.

Miracles were necessary to arrest the attention of the people, and convince them that certain men were authorized to speak for God, or, as in the case of Christ, to speak as God. These men were merely instruments



in the hands of God, media through whom God could display his beneficent and almighty power in proving that the new and sublime doctrines which were agitating the nation were from him. These miracle-workers exercised no supernatural power, nor any power whatever. They only served to connect God with the result. They uttered the needed word to secure or fix attention, and stood still while God brought it to pass. Nor was the miracle the effect of prayer, except so far as being men of prayer they were purified and made fit to stand, as it were, between Jehovah and their fellow-men.

Once more, upon this view we are necessitated to believe that the unlimited promises to prayer given in the Scriptures belong only to the age of miracles, and that since that time they have been a dead letter on the sacred page. Are we to believe that those inspiring words, so full of strength and encouragement to the church in all subsequent ages, were announced for the mere purpose of stimulating men in the exercise of supernatural power? Call to mind the flagrant sin of Moses, — pre-eminently a man of God, — in the very act of performing a miracle; and then imagine the danger of investing imperfect men with unlimited power over all the elements and forces of nature, to wield and mould them at will.

Now, if we turn to those texts of Scripture which are supposed to set forth this peculiar faith, or "faith of miracles," it will be seen that they admit of a different construction. The account of the withered fig-tree in the twenty-first chapter of Matthew presents an example of what is styled the faith of miracles. But if we consider the object which Christ had in view in the miracle of the blasted fig-tree, we shall see that it was somewhat different from, and much more than such a view of it implies. Peter, astonished to see the fig-tree dried up, says, "Master, behold it." Jesus replies, "Have faith in God." It was not to acquaint them with a new kind of faith by which they could work miracles, but greatly to increase their present faith in God and himself, so that they could do all things appertaining to their apostleship. By the boldest figure of speech he would startle, quicken, and strengthen their dull apprehensions concerning the Messiah and his mission. He sought to beget in them a profound and immovable belief in himself, before which, in the prosecution of the work which he was soon to lay upon them, mountains of difficulty and opposition would give way. He then adds, concerning prayer, "And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive."

But these unrestricted promises sometimes occur where they can have no direct reference to miracles. Jesus said to his disciples, "I go to the Father." The disciples were filled with sorrow. Jesus comforts them, saying, "Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name he will give it you." This citation, and other texts to the same

effect, prove that these unlimited promises to prayer are frequently dissociated from the subject of miracles, and are made on other grounds and for other ends.

The conclusion to which we are led by the discussion of this point, if we mistake not, is that the mode of expounding those unlimited promises to prayer which restricts their application to those who wrought miracles and to that purpose only, though common and sanctioned by many an honored name, has no adequate support. And it may not be presumptuous to suggest that this mistake, if it be one, has been induced, first, by the difficulty of explaining them in any other way; secondly, by supposing that miracles were wrought by the personal power of those who only gave the sign a claim, which, put forth by Moses in a single instance, recoiled upon him as an unpardonable crime; and, thirdly, by supposing that this supernatural energy was obtained only by this peculiar faith in prayer; while the record does not show that the apostles ordinarily preluded their miraculous deeds by any prayer whatever, common or peculiar.

#### LIGHT SOUGHT IN ANOTHER DIRECTION.

But we have not yet discovered any satisfactory method of reconciling the unlimited promises to prayer with Christian experience. From this point we turn to look for the solution of the difficulty in another direction. Let us first consider the conditions on which those precious promises rest. No better statement of these conditions can be made, perhaps, than is presented in that well-known definition of prayer: "Prayer is the offering up of our desires to God for things agreeable to his will, in the name of Christ, with confession of our sins, and thankful acknowledgment of his mercies." This formula will be accepted as setting forth the true ground of effectual prayer. We shall have occasion to notice but one of the conditions specified, for that includes the others. It is the first, viz.: "for things agreeable to his will." For if we can by any means discover what things God would be pleased to give in answer to our humble petitions, the promises would surely be fulfilled. By what means, then, when we come into his presence, shall we know what things are agreeable to the Divine will? Is it possible for finite beings to discern them? I think we are justified, without any important qualification, in saying, It is possible.

Yet, as in the vision of Balaam, it is said, "I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh," so, we fear, it must be said of this knowledge, the time has not come when, by the church at large, it can be more than theoretically apprehended; for it is not so much a product of reason as an inward experience.

And yet we may say, in passing, these promises were not prematurely announced. They are prophetic of good things to come, and serve to im-

part strength and joyful expectation to the church while it waits for their full development.

#### A HIGHER FAITH ANTICIPATED.

The New Testament, in which these promises are chiefly found, was written at the beginning of the period over which it was to shed its light to its close, and must of necessity have propounded doctrines and precepts far in advance of the times when it was sealed up. As the full significance of the Old Testament was only gradually developed through long ages of moral obscurity, so the doctrines of the New Testament must continue to unfold themselves to the rising faith of the church until the perfect day. It is among these advanced precepts that we place those passages which promise all things to prayer. Nor let it be supposed that they stand alone, that no other doctrines wait in twilight for the coming brightness to reveal them. If we attempt to designate some of the doctrines and precepts referred to, we must ask that they be contemplated, so far as possible, in the light of the future, — when the spirit of Christ shall be in men, — when the sordid pursuits of the present day shall give place to the nobler enjoyments and aspirations of man's higher nature.

#### ADVANCED PRECEPTS.

First, notice the teachings of Christ and the apostles concerning the resentment of injuries. It will not be necessary to quote passages so familiar: Avenge not yourselves; do good to your enemies; bless them, love them, feed them; when they smite thee on the right cheek, turn to them the other also. It need not be said that these precepts are not accepted to-day in their literal sense. We tone them down to our standard of morality. Their higher significance, that which stamps them most divine, we set aside as hyperbole. But let them be studied in the light of those days when meekness shall be a virtue and not a mark of cowardice, when forgiveness shall be a delight to loving souls, and they will wear another aspect. Time was when cities of refuge were a merciful provision against the resentments of men. How great the change! Is it to stop now and go no further?

Or concerning the danger of riches; if there be anything in the teachings of Christ on which he laid a special emphasis as involving consequences the most terrible and certain, it was the danger of riches. But these awful warnings are of no account to-day. Those faithful, fearful words are set at naught. If Christians do not succeed in getting rich, it is simply because they cannot. In the din and turmoil of money-making the voice of Christ is not heard. Will any one presume to say that it shall be so to the end?

Or, again, concerning trust in God. Christ teaches most explicitly, Take no thought for your life, nor for your body; consider the lilies; remember the young ravens, the sparrows, the fowls of the air, and that the very hairs of your head are numbered. Does the church of to-day believe in these precepts, except in some depleted sense? Nay, verily, the time certainly must come when the Divine love and tenderness which they breathe will be more worthily appreciated. Let those who feel authorized tone these Divine teachings down until the faith of this material age can grasp them; but let me wait rather, in hope, the time when they shall be literally fulfilled.

These citations are sufficient for our purpose. Of the same nature are those explicit, unlimited promises to prayer. Let them stand in their strength.

#### A QUESTION ANSWERED.

Returning now to the questions, "Is it possible for finite beings to comply with the conditions of prevailing prayer, by a certain perception of the things which it may be agreeable to God to grant?" and "How shall they discern them?" we answer more explicitly: The way of access into the council-chambers of heaven, where the Father discloses his secrets to waiting souls, *lies through the narrow door of personal holiness*. "For the secret of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will show them his covenant." "But know that the Lord hath set apart him that is godly for himself; the Lord will hear when I call upon him." When Jacob had undergone the chastening of the Lord during the long years of his exile, we find that as a "prince he had power with God" in prayer. Moses, — the man of God pre-eminently, — what an influence was his by prayer! Hear him in his sublime boldness calling upon Jehovah! "Turn from thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against thy people." "And the Lord repented of the evil which he thought to do unto his people." On another occasion the Lord yielded to his entreaties, "and said unto Moses, I will do this thing also which thou hast spoken, for thou hast found grace in my sight, and I know thee by name." So the prophets prevailed with God in prayer, not as prophets, but as holy men. The history of the church furnishes many isolated examples of holy men whose prayers have been answered in ways as striking, and for objects as difficult to mere human achievement, as anything which we ascribe to supernatural agencies.

Even now there is, here and there, one who approximates this sublime requirement of perfect holiness. Here and there is one who is crucified to the world, and serves the Lord with undivided affection. He "abides with the Father and the Son," and they with him. He has high and holy communion with God, and studies his will. To such a one God reveals

himself, admits him into his holy presence and clothes him with gifts of grace and spiritual discernment, limited only by the danger of misuse and spiritual pride. Surely there could be but little danger that such a one would not discern the things for which he ought to pray ! Thus walking with God the life itself is prayer, — unceasing prayer, ascending as incense and a pure offering before the throne continually. The whole tenor of Scripture indicates that in proportion to this degree of their sanctification men have been taken into the Divine counsels, trusted with grave responsibilities, and honored with tokens of God's highest favor. Says Coleridge : —

“He prayeth well who loveth well  
Both man and bird and beast.

He prayeth best who loveth best  
All things both great and small.”

We come, then, to the conclusion that *oneness with God* is the grand prerequisite to understanding his will. Even as our Saviour said, “If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you.”

#### AN OBJECTION CONSIDERED.

It may be objected as against the conclusion that personal holiness is the comprehensive condition of effectual prayer, that our Lord in the garden was denied his petition, — “Let this cup pass from me.” Were it true, as some doubt, that his petition was denied, it might be said that the whole transaction was altogether unique ; that it took place on a higher plane of religious phenomena than mortals can aspire to understand ; that it is veiled in the mystery of the incarnation, and therefore cannot be regarded as proving any point of merely human experience. This is our answer to the objection, and we deem it sufficient. But there is another view of Christ's prayer in the garden, which we inscribe without comment. One who has had a deep experience of the power of prayer has written : “Some have supposed that Christ was praying against the cross. Did Christ ever shrink from the cross? Never. He came into the world on purpose to die on the cross, and he never shrank from it. But he was afraid he should die in the garden before he came to the cross. The burden on his soul was so great, and produced such an agony that he felt as if he was on the point of dying. His soul was sorrowful even unto death ; but after the angel appeared unto him, we hear no more of his agony of soul. He prayed for relief from that cup, and his prayer was answered.”

The case of St. Paul praying ineffectually for the removal of the afflictive thorn may be cited for the same purpose. But we are assured by the apostle himself, that he was at that time far from perfection. He

tells us that the sin of spiritual pride was so immanent in him, that, along with the wonderful visions which he was privileged to behold, there was given him a thorn in the flesh. And it is to be noticed that so soon as he understood the necessity of it he ceased to pray for its removal.

Should it be asked why, if oneness with God is the comprehensive condition of the unlimited promises made to prayer, — why, if the meaning on the surface of those texts is not the full one, it was not expressed in other terms? the answer might be: The question is equally pertinent to many other subjects of deep interest to men, which Christ might have settled by an authoritative word, but did not. He told his disciples, in answer to a similar question, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." Those profound problems which could not be categorically unfolded were in time to be wrought into the life and experience of the Church, and be read in its history.

Having shown, so far as I have been able, the fallacy of certain popular beliefs, by which the abundant promises made to prayer are thought to be reconciled with their scanty fulfilment; and that the more plausible method, which makes a distinction between the faith of miracles and ordinary Christian faith, is a distinction without a difference; and having endeavored to show that personal holiness is the implied prime condition of those most precious promises, I have but little more to offer.

The time is coming, we may devoutly hope, when the glare of the world will be less blinding, and the purer light from above will enable the followers of Christ to see the meaning of his most gracious words more clearly; when Christians shall love one another as Christ loves them; when no one shall desire to eclipse his neighbor in wealth, in honor, or in any secular advantage; when Christians shall be one, as Christ and the Father are one. Then shall these advanced precepts of our Lord stand forth to the faith of his saints in all their literal strength and fulness. Then the Church will have taken joyful possession of them, as of treasures always at hand, but not appreciated, most needful to the body and the soul. Then will Christians, dwelling as in the household of God, and walking daily by his side, hold sweet and holy converse with Him concerning the methods of his grace and the wonderful plan of redemption. The prayers of their lips may be few and brief, but their hearts, aglow with holy love and unutterable desire, that the measure of God's glory among men may be full, will cry unceasingly, "Abba, Father." Beholding them in all their tender longings and sweet submissiveness to his will, how will he not freely give them all things! •

ALFRED WALKER.

NEW HAVEN, Conn.

## THE VOCATION OF THE PREACHER.

"WHY," says a writer in the *London Times*,—"why this preaching? Why does this man talk to us? Who is he that he should talk? Why not be content to worship only, when we go to church? Besides, ministers are simply nuisances."

This is bitter, humiliating language. Do we not, however, hear the same thing said in substance nearer home, where the good that preachers do is sneeringly impugned in remarks like these,—What are ministers good for? What do they do that is useful? Do they make two blades of grass grow where one grew before? Do they add anything to the sum of human knowledge or thought? Do they, on their own ground, make men better, honester, truer fathers, sons, brothers, friends, citizens? Does he who listens to the preacher from week to week, and year to year, lead a more noble and unselfish life than many a man who is not his hearer, and who is, it may be, an avowed disbeliever? Why should the preacher have a profession? What right has he to make a vocation of preaching, and call it a business, like other regular business callings that mean something useful and solid? If now the charges implied in such remarks *are* true,—if the preacher absolutely brings nothing useful to the world; if he adds nothing to its intelligence and happiness; if, above all, he does not make men better, then, indeed, he has no right to exist,—the village blacksmith has more right to be than he.

Free-thinking journalism, like that of the *London Times* and the *Saturday Review*, and their imitators in this country, has declared its intention of driving out of existence the very name and vocation of the preacher; and journalism is a mighty power both for good and evil. Lamartine said that, "before this century shall have run out, journalism will be the whole press,—the whole of human thought. Thought will not have time to ripen, to accommodate itself into the form of a book. The book will arrive too late. The only book possible, soon, will be a newspaper." If the newspaper becomes opposed to the preacher, which will win the day? In a word, we cannot conceal the fact, that it is growing to be quite the fashion, not only in familiar speech, but in the various forms of literature that find the readiest currency among men, to decry the vocation of the preacher, and to set forth in more or less direct terms his general inutility and insufficiency. Modern sermons are compared unfavorably with other public oratorical and literary efforts; and it is said, Why is the religious teacher so markedly inferior in power to the scientific, the political, the academical lecturer,—or even the lecturer on moral reform?



Without indorsing these things, or in any manner admitting their truth, I mention them as showing the drift of public opinion, and as indicating that men are becoming more and more regardless of the fact of the rightful existence of the ministerial office, especially where the thing it stands for is wanting. To be a minister nowadays means in itself little or nothing in the estimation of a great mass of men. The fictitious worth, and in some respects the real worth, of the office itself has pretty much died out. It has gone with the priestly name and raiment that have sometimes, it must be confessed, invested imbecility, false pretension, and moral corruption. The minister stands now as a man among men, almost entirely on his own merits. He gets little from his office. He is worth about what he is in himself. If he is a man of superior intelligence and character, he will command the respect of men; and if he is not such a man, his being a minister injures more than helps him. Never was the old Roman *esse quam videri* more significant and sternly true than in these days of matter-of-fact, of the destruction of sentiment and illusion.

Now, if these things are so, should not ministers and preachers clearly comprehend the present condition of public opinion and look it fairly in the face? As brave men, and as sagacious men, are not ministers called upon to recognize the great changes which have taken place in public opinion (of course in some vicinities and communities less marked than in others), and accept these changes and make the most of them? They should not blindly and vaguely continue to rely upon the respect of the past, but they should gird up their self-respect, and be ready to ask nothing more than the world is willing to give. They should feel that they are thrown back on their own resources and manhood, not forgetting, also, the help of God. They should scorn to be any longer revered and courted and caressed for a name and office only, rather than honored and loved for the real things that the office stands for. By so doing, they will come nearer to the apostolic standard, in that primitive time when to be a preacher of Christ had nothing of extrinsic worth or glory in it, but, on the contrary, was a despised and persecuted vocation, the mark of the world's indignation, ridicule, and contempt.

Here is something, in truth, which appeals to the noblest ambition of a man,—to make Christ and his religion respected in the office of his preacher, in spite of the world's increasingly strong opposition to a calling which it looks upon as interfering with the ordinary pursuits and professions of men, and as setting up unwarrantable claims of respect and authority.

The struggle has now come down to the bare facts of the case, stripped of all that is factitious, and should we not, as ministers of Christ, be glad that it is so? The sacred office is now to stand simply upon the divine

institution or foundation which it represents. It is not to usurp any show of mere ecclesiastical or external human authority. It is to depend upon the simple truth, and the truth of Him who calls man into it. If the gospel is true, its minister and preacher has a right to be, and to proclaim the gospel. If Christianity is the message of God through his Son, then it must continue to be committed unto faithful men, who shall be able to teach it to others.

But in this new state of things, or at least in the foreshadowed condition of public sentiment toward which we are very rapidly approaching, those who assume the ministerial office must be men who are faithful and able to teach, or else they cannot hope to command the attention of men, or claim the support of God. What, personally speaking, is needed by ministers in order to continue to maintain the high place and just influence of their vocation, may be comprehended under the two words, *character* and *culture*. He whose spirit and life are not in essential conformity with the truth he preaches cannot expect to draw aid from the truth, or from that Spirit who inspires and reveals the truth. He has no higher apodictic power, to which men, in spite of their theories and prejudices and oppositions, are so constituted that they must yield respect and obedience. A man must have a more pure, absorbing devotion to the truth of Jesus than the Jesuit has to his society, if he would have that truth prevail. And as to the necessary culture of his own powers, not only spiritual, but intellectual, — of all his faculties, this truth was never more needful to be comprehended than at present. Priestcraft is going fast, and the faster the better; but the loving craft of earnest and intelligent ministers of God's word should take its place. I lay it down as an axiom, that the teacher of Christianity is bound to make Christianity the ruling power in the world, because Christianity is the will and word of God, whose right it is to rule in all things; and to attempt to do this without the putting forth of every energy, without the thorough training and using of every faculty, shows that a man is not in earnest. Government, science, and the press are each striving for this predominating influence in the world with an untiring, self-sacrificing, even terrible manifestation of energy, and should the preacher be less in earnest for his cause, or neglectful in the cultivation of any of his powers? The time has gone when preachers ruled the world, — not only governments, but the minds of men. St. Bernard ruled Europe, or all the so-called Christian world. This was partly owing to outside circumstances and events, and partly to real superiority of mind and spirit. No true Christian would wish to bring back the same state of things; but shall the ministers and preachers of God's gospel in this day tamely yield their rational and good empire over men's minds and hearts, and sink to imbeciles, dragging down their holy cause with them, because they will

not make the necessary effort to hold their place in every true and lawful way? Are they prepared to give up this glorious heritage, this sceptre of light and love, without a struggle?

If they do not wish to do this, they must be true to the ministry committed to them, and be untiringly diligent in the cultivation of every faculty and power. They must cast off indolence, and easy ways, and self-seeking. They must awake to see the true state of things. They must not be doing everything else, but they must be absorbed in their own work. They must be hard-working and studious men. They must be superior and God-elected men. Hugh Miller once said, "True ministers cannot be manufactured out of ordinary men — men ordinary in talent and character — in a given number of years, and then passed by the imposition of hands into the sacred office; ministers, when real, are all special creations of the grace of God." To maintain their place and to be the leaders of men, preachers should feel the necessity of devoting themselves to severe mental and spiritual training, and by studying, praying, thinking, — by close self-denying labor that sometimes sees the stars grow pale, — to obtain a deep and broad culture. They must learn, too, the art of preaching, for it is an art, the highest art, — not indeed "the black art," or any art of magic whereby one may hope through a feeble and indolent effort and the repetition of certain pious or theological phrases, to enchant and change men; but it is a skill or power formed on will and intelligence, and on the highest tact, — that of the heart, — and whose laws and methods are certain and profound. One effects the great ends of preaching, under God, by the thoughtful adaptation of means to ends, as in any other business, by the putting forth of mental energy, by deep meditation on divine truth and its wise adaptation to the human heart. It is by learning to think, to reason, to deal with mind, to persuade and sway men, to speak with plainness, power, and personality. No one can be a great preacher until he is aroused to the conception of the real difficulties of his work, — that it is not a mere official work, that it is a work which will not do itself, but that it must be pushed on with the entire vigor of the being, and that it makes its requisition upon every power and attainment.

This is seen when we consider the actual sphere of the preacher's activity.

Young men who have been scientifically educated, and who have been accustomed to look at truth in a purely scientific way, on coming to the study of the ministry, are sometimes at a loss to know precisely what is the definite nature and sphere of their duties, and how to classify themselves and their work. Their work cannot, in truth, be classified. It does not come under any of the sciences, for it does not primarily concern knowledge, to which science absolutely belongs, but has to do, first of all,

with those things that belong to revelation and form the object of faith. These are in some sense indefinable. The sphere of the preacher, to express it in general terms, is *man in his higher relations to God*; and the difficult task of the true preacher is, not to be discouraged by the vast and absolutely boundless nature of his work, while he still patiently endeavors to reduce it to some systematic and definite mode of action, to a real business, in the employment of his own practical skill, culture, knowledge, and force, in subordination to higher and divine forces.

The two great departments, or fields, of the preacher's work, to speak more specifically, are the moral and the spiritual portions of man's nature. The moral faculty is radically different from, and is higher than the faculty of knowledge; it is a more intimate and essential part of man's nature, in which his true being and worth reside,—his genuine manhood. The idea of right is the expression of the highest law—the law of God—in man's being; and in this broad realm the preacher is called to teach and act. He is to bring the law of right and wrong to bear upon all moral actions, works, and institutions of men, and, above all, upon the character of the individual soul, so that it may be convinced of wrong, of sin, and thus be led to the true sources of righteousness. He goes underneath the faculties of the soul,—its hopes and fears, its tastes and affections,—and reaches the real man of the heart, setting forth clearly, and making practical application of the eternal law of duty. It is thought by some that preaching to the conscience consists in arousing the fears and passions of men, in alarming the mind with the threatenings and punishments of the law. The faithful preacher does this in its own proper time and place, but he does more than this, which in some sense is negative and incidental (though a most important and solemn incident), rather than something that belongs intrinsically to the law.

The true preacher goes beyond this, and shows positively the actual way of right doing, the path of duty, and the principles of true goodness, so that the moral sense may be enlightened, and the character may be built up in all nobleness and Christian virtue. He probes every system that is wrong, every opinion that is corrupt, every policy or business that is founded on false principles, every character that is wrought upon an unsound standard of morals. His vocation should be to keep the moral atmosphere in a healthy condition; and if to effect that, he must preach plainly the will of God as declared against all iniquity and unrighteousness among men, sanctioned by the terrible penalties of God's violated law, he should not shrink from so doing; but he must not at the same time neglect the still greater duty of teaching men *how to be good*, of showing them the way of righteousness, and of training them in it by patient, intelligent, constant precept and example. All conditions of men, all kinds

of occupation, all practices and customs which stand in any true relationship with the moral law, which have in them the principles of right and wrong, come within the circle of the preacher's notice and responsibility. He is not called of God to preach poetry or philosophy or metaphysics, but to arouse the dull and sleeping conscience, and to lead the awakened soul into the paths of virtue and right living. He is to say with no uncertain voice what is right and what is wrong. He is to be a moral teacher. We do not want any more undecided ministers, but we want men of courage, who hold clear opinions, who have a strong sense of duty, and who will not shrink from doing or saying what they think to be right both in doctrine and life. They may not always agree with the mass of Christians in particular cases, but we want men who shall be leaders in moral questions, who have the love of the law of God in their hearts, who are men of invincible truth. The growing materialism of this age, which is animated by motives lying entirely outside of the moral nature and dealing with the sensual exclusively; which is building up a world-empire more powerful than that of old Rome, a kingdom of this earth earthy; which is shaping for itself a colossal religion out of a conglomerate of forces drawn from money capital, gold speculation, land-ownership, mining, and railroad enterprise; which has its own temples and apostles, its missions and methods of propagandism,—this material system of worldly religion is to be fearlessly assailed by the preacher of righteousness; for though slavery in its outward shape is dead in our land, yet slavery in its moral aspects, as another form of Antichrist on earth, is still reigning,—its tyrannic power is felt and its lash heard, as it drives its crowds to their servile toil in the burning fields of gain, as it urges on inexorably the masses of those who are entangled in the worse forms of dishonest trade, intemperance, libertinism, luxury, fashionable display and ambition, corrupt political strife, the prostitution of public justice, and every form of gross material life which resists the entrance of spiritual and divine influences. In other words, Sin, in its manifold shapes, still leads men captive at its will in the world, and the preacher of truth has a field to work in as broad as the domain of sin. The complete emancipation of the race from the bondage of moral evil, and the highest perfection and beauty of moral character,—humanity, the child of God, raised and glorified in the image of the Son, the perfect man,—this is the preacher's aim, and nothing below this can express it. He is not dealing essentially with reasoning or theology, but with living truth,—that original law of God written in the conscience,—upon which alone all true character is built.

But the preacher's sphere is not only the varied world of morals, the broad realm of law, duty, and character, but the still more glorious world of *faith*. This comprises the highest spiritual nature. This has to do not so

much with the law of God as written in the human soul, but rather with the relations of the soul itself to the supernatural and the divine; that which does not so much belong to its own constitution as to the revelation of God in his Word, Spirit, and Son.

Many who think and talk very subtly and nobly of culture sometimes forget this higher sphere of faith, in which lie the most profound springs of true culture and character. The preacher is appointed, above all, to make the soul know and love God, to reveal and interpret to the soul that wonderful nature of goodness and love; for it has been well said that "the best preaching is only a simple testimony of what God is." The preacher is to unfold the things of God, to show the true nature of God to men, and to announce the "glad tidings" that through his Son the unholy and sinful soul may become a partaker of his nature, and be even like him in love and purity. How transcendently blessed an office to lead human spirits out of their gloom and delirium to seek and find their Heavenly Father, and their kinship to the Eternal God; to preach the "glad tidings" of a perfect life in his kingdom of light and love, where all shall be kings and priests unto God, — and, more than that, dear children, upon whom he will lavish his love, and to whom he will reveal the beauties of his character!

The preacher is the minister of the word, the servant of the voice of God, speaking the direct instructions and messages of God to the human soul. He shows the way of a divine life. He builds up a spiritual kingdom in this gross and sensual world. He teaches a finer wisdom, a higher love, a broader brotherhood, a purer communion, a more perfect philosophy, a more unselfish virtue, a more childlike worship, a manlier citizenship, a more guarded peace, a more divinely human life, — an inspiration of the life of Christ, — and a more lofty hope and destiny of the race, than any other human instructor. He teaches men a way to be free, such as no political essayist has set forth; conducting men through the truth into that spiritual freedom from sin and selfishness, which form the root of all slavery and oppression. He nourishes a righteousness in a state more assured and universal than a Hampden dreamed of. It is true that culture polishes the mind and makes it flashing and clear, but the truth, rightly preached, develops the inner beauties of the soul, as it is refined and wrought upon by an unseen and Divine hand, and grows purer and purer day by day. While other professions are all of them limited by the demands of this life, the preacher fixes his aim in the eternal life. He is the guide of the spirit to that life. If the spiritual life ended with the body, or with the mere physical life with its animating, intelligent principle, then let the preacher be banished as having no right to be; but if God has made man for a higher life, then the preacher has a right to exist, fully as much so as the lawyer,

the doctor, the farmer, the legislator, the author. He has a business which is as legitimately founded upon one part of man's nature as their professions are founded upon another part. His vocation postulates itself in the need of the human spirit to know the living God for the true life.

If the preacher, on the other hand, does not make men rightly to know God, and to know him better and better, his mouth should be stopped, and he has no lawful business. If he does not preach the true message of God, he should be ostracized without mercy from the ranks of legitimate occupations among men. If he has no influence upon the nurture and building up of true goodness in the life both of the individual and society, he had better dig and plant the honest earth, that brings forth something good to the eater,—a real, if lower, gift of God. The great company of preachers whose feet are beautiful upon the mountains as the bringers of salvation, the publishers of peace, should grow less and less, until they discover their true vocation which cannot be gainsaid nor denied by men, viz. the proclamation of the "glad tidings," the announcement of the true nature of God, that God is the Heavenly Father of all men, and that the gulf between his purity and their sinfulness has been bridged by the loving work of a Mediator, so that all men may be reunited to the righteousness and love of God.

I have endeavored thus to point out the vocation of the preacher in its principal features and elements, although he may be influential and useful in a hundred other ways, and may make himself felt to the extremities of the intellectual and social world. His sphere is an exalted one. His right to be consists in his being true to his calling. If he is not a superior man morally and spiritually, if he is not a leader of men in the higher life, if he is not a trusted guide of the soul in the things of God, if he is not familiar with that spiritual life to which he conducts, and can go and come freely to and from it, he verily is not needed, and the world can do without him. All of us who are professed preachers of God's Word have thus great need to watch diligently our hearts and lives, and to ask ourselves if we are walking worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called, if we have truly appreciated its difficulties, and to take upon us shame and confusion of face for every particular in which we have proved ourselves unfaithful or even stupidly insensible and inappreciative; for our power is departing from us in all wherein we are unworthy, and it will altogether vanish away if indeed we are not, like the primitive preachers who conquered the world, able to be "ensamples" in that truth, that righteousness, that charity, that true manhood, that Christlike holy living, that Christlike love of souls, and that inward peace and joy which come from God, which we preach to others.

JAMES M. HOPPIN.

NEW HAVEN, Conn.



## THE BROOKFIELD ASSOCIATION.

OF the twenty-seven ministerial associations of the Congregational denomination in Massachusetts, only six were organized previous to the present century. Of these the Brookfield Association, organized June 22, 1757, stands chronologically as the fourth. The associations bearing an earlier date are "The Essex South," "The Hampshire," and "The Mendon."

The Brookfield Association having been organized at the house of Rev. Eli Forbes, D. D., pastor of what is now the First Congregational Church in North Brookfield, the centennial celebration of its organization was observed in the house of worship of that church, June 30, 1857.

Without entering, in this article, upon the history of the Association as delineated on that occasion, yet, as matter of historic interest, under different classifications we give the following facts respecting the Association during the first century of its existence.

*1. Territorial Limits.*

Strictly speaking, a ministerial association has no territorial limits, for it is composed of persons in their individual capacity, but in a general way we are accustomed to speak of an Association as embracing churches, or the towns where the members reside. This was often a matter of convenience, particularly before Conferences were organized in which churches as such are represented. Speaking in this general way, we may say that within the first century of its existence the Brookfield Association embraced twenty-six towns and thirty churches. The towns are as follows:—

1. Barre; 2. Brimfield; 3. Brookfield; 4. Charlton; 5. Dana; 6. Dudley; 7. Enfield; 8. Greenwich; 9. Hardwick; 10. Holden; 11. Holland; 12. Leicester; 13. New Braintree; 14. North Brookfield; 15. Oakham; 16. Palmer; 17. Petersham; 18. Rutland; 19. Southbridge; 20. Spencer; 21. Sturbridge; 22. Ware; 23. Ward (now Auburn); 24. West Brookfield; 25. Western (now Warren); 26. Worcester. The church in Storrsville was disbanded in 1852, and the church in Dana organized, in the main, of the same persons, thus making two churches. There were two churches in North Brookfield and two in Ware. And the church in Globe Village (Southbridge), although it has never been connected with the Brookfield Associational Conference, is here numbered among the thirty, because the pastor of it was a member of the Association.

Before the close of the century the pastors in ten of these towns had

withdrawn to, or their successors had become connected with, other Associations, viz.: Barre,<sup>1</sup> Enfield, Greenwich, Holden, Leicester, Palmer, Petersham, Rutland, Ward (or Auburn), and Worcester.

## 2. Catalogue of Members.

In the column denoting the manner in which the person's connection with the Association was terminated, "withdrew" indicates change from one Association to another without change of residence. "Rem." or "Removed" denotes change of residence. A blank shows that the person was still a member when the century closed. No changes after the close of the century are here noted.

Name.	College.	Residence.	Joined.	Left.
Benjamin Ruggles,	Y. C.	New Braintree,	June 22, 1757	Died Jan. 3, 1784
David White,	Y. C.	Hardwick,	June 22, 1757	Died Jan. 6, 1784.
Joshua Eaton,	H. C.	Spencer,	June 22, 1757	Died April 2, 1772.
Isaac Jones,	Y. C.	Western,	June 22, 1757	Died July —, 1784
Eli Forbes, D. D.	H. C.	(North) Brookfield,	June 22, 1757	Died Dec. 15, 1804.
Eza Thayer,	H. C.	Ware, 1st Parish	May 18, 1763	Died Feb. 11, 1775.
Nathan Fiske, D. D.	H. C.	Brookfield, S. Parish	May 18, 1763	Died Nov. 24, 1799.
Joshua Paine,	—	Sturbridge	May 18, 1763	Died Dec. 28, 1799.
Joseph Parsons,	H. C.	Brookfield, W. Parish	Mar. 21, 1764	Died Jan. 17, 1771.
Robert Cutler,	H. C.	Greenwich	Mar. 21, 1764	Died Feb. 24, 1786.
Joseph Davis,	H. C.	Holden	Sept. 18, 1765	Rem. Oct. 18, 1772.
Josiah Dana,	H. C.	Barre	Aug. 28, 1769	Died Oct. 1, 1801.
John Strickland,	Y. C.	Oakham,	Oct. 30, 1771	Rem. Jan. 2, 1773.
Ephraim Ward,	H. C.	Brookfield, West Parish,	Oct. 30, 1771	Died Mar. 9, 1818.
Nehemiah Williams,	H. C.	Brimfield,	Feb. 28, 1776	Died Nov. 26, 1796.
Joseph Pope,	H. C.	Spencer,	Feb. 28, 1776	Died Mar. 8, 1826.
Joseph Buckminster,	H. C.	Rutland,	Oct. 16, 1776	Died Nov. 3, 1792.
Joseph Appleton,	B. U.	(North) Brookfield,	Oct. 16, 1776	Died July 25, 1795.
Daniel Foster,	D. C.	New Braintree,	Mar. 3, 1779	Died Sept. 4, 1795.
Daniel Tomlinson,	Y. C.	Oakham,	Oct. 28, 1789	Died Oct. 29, 1842.
Thomas Holt,	Y. C.	Hardwick,	Aug. 25, 1790	Died Feb. 21, 1836.
Joseph Blodget,	D. C.	Greenwich,	April 29, 1791	Died Nov. 26, 1833.
Joshua Crosby,	—	Enfield,	Aug. 31, 1791	Withdrew.
Stephen Baxter,	H. C.	Western,	May 2, 1792	Rem. Oct. 17, 1804.
Reuben Moss,	Y. C.	Ware, 1st Parish,	Oct. 31, 1792	Died Feb. 17, 1809.
John Fiske, D. D.	D. C.	New Braintree,	Sept. 27, 1797	Died Mar. 15, 1855.
Thomas Snell, D. D.	D. C.	(North) Brookfield,	Sept. 26, 1798	
Erastus Larned,	B. U.	Charlton,	May 1, 1799	Rem. Sept. 16, 1802.
Zephaniah S. Moore, D. D.	D. C.	Leicester,	Sept. 24, 1800	Rem. Oct. 28, 1811.
Micah Stone,	H. C.	Brookfield, South Parish,	Jan. 5, 1803	Died Aug. 21, 1862.
Otis Lane,	H. C.	Sturbridge,	Sept. 26, 1804	Rem. Feb. 24, 1819.
Edwards Whipple,	W. C.	Charlton,	Sept. 26, 1804	Rem. Mar. —, 1821.
William B. Wesson,	W. C.	Hardwick,	Sept. 24, 1806	Cut off May 16, '22.
Sylvester Burt,	W. C.	Western,	Sept. 30, 1807	Rem. Dec. 31, 1811.
Warren Fay, D. D.	H. C.	Brimfield,	Jan. 4, 1809	Rem. June 26, 1811.
Samuel Ware,	W. C.	Ware, 1st Parish,	Jan. 2, 1811	Rem. July 18, 1826.
Simeon Colton,	Y. C.	Palmer,	April 29, 1812	Rem. Nov. 13, 1831.
John Nelson, D. D.	W. C.	Leicester,	Sept. 30, 1812	Withdrew.
Joseph Vaill, D. D.	Y. C.	Brimfield,	April 21, 1814	Rem. Sept. 6, 1834.
Joseph Vaill, D. D.	Y. C.	" (reunited)	Jan. 3, 1838	Rem. Dec. 19, 1841.
Monson C. Gaylord,	P. C.	Western,	June 19, 1816	Rem. July 17, 1823.
Jason Park,	—	Southbridge,	Jan. 1, 1817	Rem. Dec. 16, 1832.
Eliakim Phelps, D. D.	U. C.	Brookfield, West Parish,	April 16, 1817	Rem. Oct. 25, 1823.
Josiah Clark,	W. C.	Rutland,	Sept. 17, 1818	Withdrew.
Charles A. Goodrich,	Y. C.	Worcester,	Jan. 6, 1819	Withdrew.
Enoch Pond, D. D.	B. U.	Ward,	Jan. 6, 1819	Withdrew.
Stephen Crosby,	U. C.	Spencer,	Jan. 5, 1820	Rem. May 31, 1825.
Alvan Bond, D. D.	B. U.	Sturbridge,	Jan. 5, 1820	Rem. Oct. 3, 1831.
Joseph I. Foot, D. D.	U. C.	Brookfield, West Parish,	Jan. 3, 1827	Rem. May 1, 1832.
Augustus B. Reed,	B. U.	Ware, 1st Parish,	Jan. 3, 1827	Died Sept. 30, 1838.
Parsons Cook, D. D.	W. C.	Ware Village,	April 18, 1827	Rem. April 18, 1835.
Levi Packard,	B. U.	Spencer,	June 12, 1827	Rem. Aug. 23, 1853.
Bancroft Fowler,	Y. C.	West Brookfield,	Oct. 1, 1828	Removed, 1831.
Joseph K. Ware,	A. C.	Palmer,	Oct. 1, 1828	Rem. Mar. 16, 1831.
John Wilder,	B. U.	Charlton,	Jan. 7, 1829	Rem. July 2, 1833

<sup>1</sup> Barre has, however, now returned to the old fold.

Name.	College.	Residence.	Joined.	Left.
Martyn Tupper,	P. C.	Hardwick,	Jan. 7, 1829	Rem. April 29, 1835.
Martyn Tupper,	P. C.	" (reunited),	Aug. 4, 1852	
John Storm,	M. C.	Barre,	June 9, 1829	Rem. May 17, 1832.
Asa Hixon, Jr.	B. U.	Oakham,	Oct. 14, 1829	Rem. Dec. 26, 1832.
Oren Catlin,	—	Western,	Jan. 7, 1830	Rem. Oct. —, 1831.
William Wolcott,	Y. C.	Petersham,	April 20, 1831	Rem. June 25, 1834.
Ebenezer Everett,	D. C.	Oakham,	Jan. 3, 1832	Removed — 1833.
Joseph S. Clark, D. D.	A. C.	Sturbridge,	April 18, 1832	Rem. Dec. 20, 1838.
Charles Fitch,	B. U.	Western,	Oct. 5, 1832	Rem. May —, 1834.
Francis Horton,	B. U.	Brookfield, West Parish,	April 17, 1833	Rem. Sept. 15, 1841.
Samuel Backus,	U. C.	Palmer,	June 11, 1833	Withdrew.
James Kimball,	M. C.	Oakham,	June 11, 1833	
Moses G. Grosvenor,	D. C.	Barre,	Jan. 1, 1834	Rem. May 14, 1834.
William H. Whitemore,	Y. C.	Charlton,	April 16, 1834	Removed — 1835.
Richard Woodruff,	U. C.	Brookfield, South Parish,	April 16, 1834	Rem. Sept. 12, 1838
Caleb B. Tracy,	W. C.	Petersham,	Jan. 5, 1835	Rem. Oct. 4, 1837.
Joseph Fuller,	M. C.	Brimfield,	April 15, 1835	Rem. June 7, 1837.
James H. Francis,	Y. C.	Dudley,	April 15, 1835	Rem. June 26, 1837.
John F. Stone,	—	Barre,	June 8, 1835	Rem. Nov. 17, 1836.
James Sandford,	B. U.	Holland,	June 14, 1836	Rem. May —, 1847.
Eber Carpenter,	Y. C.	Southbridge,	June 14, 1836	
Edward J. Fuller,	A. C.	Hardwick,	June 14, 1836	Rem. Mar. 22, 1847.
Isaac R. Barbour,	M. C.	Charlton,	April 19, 1837	Rem. Aug. 8, 1839.
George Trask,	B. C.	Warren,	June 14, 1837	Rem. April —, 1847.
William Eaton,	W. C.	Hardwick,	Jan. 3, 1838	Died April 15, 1840.
Amasa Dewey,	Y. C.	Storrsville,	Jan. 3, 1838	Died Jan. 6, 1840.
Samuel A. Fay,	A. C.	Barre,	Jan. 3, 1838	Rem. July 1, 1840.
Walter Follett,	M. C.	Dudley,	April 16, 1838	Rem. Sept. 28, 1841.
Jona. E. Woodbridge,	W. C.	Ware Village,	Oct. 3, 1838	Rem. Dec. 28, 1840.
Hervey Smith,	—	Ware, West Parish,	Jan. 9, 1839	Removed — 1846.
Washington A. Nichols,	A. C.	Brookfield, South Parish,	Jan. 9, 1839	— Jan. 11, 1843.
Washington A. Nichols,	A. C.	" (reunited),	April 21, 1847	Removed — 1854.
David R. Austin,	—	Sturbridge,	Oct. 1, 1839	Rem. Oct. 1, 1851.
George W. Underwood,	U. C.	Charlton,	April 21, 1840	Rem. Mar. 31, 1843.
Barnabas M. Fay,	Y. C.	Hardwick,	June 9, 1840	Rem. Aug. 23, 1843.
Erasmus D. Moore,	—	Barre,	Aug. 5, 1840	Rem. Oct. 19, 1842.
William E. Dixon,	W. C.	Ware, West Parish,	June 8, 1841	Rem. May 25, 1842.
James C. Houghton,	D. C.	Storrsville,	June 8, 1841	Rem. April 27, 1843.
Moses Chase,	D. C.	West Brookfield,	June 14, 1842	Rem. Oct. 28, 1843.
George C. Partridge,	A. C.	Brimfield,	June 14, 1842	Rem. Oct. 26, 1845.
Nahum Gale, D. D.	A. C.	Ware Village,	Aug. 3, 1842	Rem. June —, 1851.
Rodney Gove Dennis,	B. C.	West Brookfield,	Oct. 5, 1842	Rem. April 9, 1843.
David N. Coburn,	A. C.	Ware, 1st Parish,	Oct. 5, 1842	Rem. April 17, 1854.
Moses K. Cross,	A. C.	Palmer,	Jan. 3, 1843	Withdrew.
Henry B. Holmes,	—	West Brookfield,	Jan. 4, 1843	Rem. Oct. 26, 1845.
Lyman Whiting,	—	Brookfield, South Parish,	June 13, 1843	Rem. Mar. 28, 1847.
Joshua Bates, D. D.	H. C.	Dudley,	Oct. 3, 1843	Died Jan. 14, 1854.
John Keep,	A. C.	Storrsville (afterw'ds Dana Cen.),	Oct. 2, 1844	
Alanson Alvord,	—	Charlton,	Oct. 2, 1844	Removed — 1846.
Leonard S. Parker,	—	Brookfield, West Parish,	Jan. 7, 1845	Rem. April 7, 1851.
Asa Mann,	A. C.	Hardwick,	April 23, 1845	Rem. Oct. 14, 1851.
Nelson Clark,	D. C.	Charlton,	Oct. 7, 1846	Removed — 1850.
Samuel Hutchings,	W. C.	Brookfield,	Oct. 6, 1847	Rem. April 7, 1851.
Benjamin Ober,	—	Holland,	Oct. 6, 1847	Rem. April —, 1851.
Charles Smith,	A. C.	Warren,	Jan. 4, 1848	Rem. April 13, 1852.
Moses Miller,	B. U.	Brookfield,	Oct. 2, 1849	Died April 22, 1855.
Jason Morse,	A. C.	Brimfield,	June 11, 1850	
John Haven,	A. C.	Charlton,	June 10, 1851	
Theron G. Colton,	Y. C.	Ware Village,	Oct. 7, 1851	Rem. Mar. 26, 1855.
Christopher Cushing,	Y. C.	North Brookfield,	June 8, 1852	
Alvah C. Page,	A. C.	Holland,	June 8, 1852	Rem. April 12, 1854.
Jesse K. Bragg,	A. C.	Brookfield,	Sept. 14, 1852	
Swift Byington,	Y. C.	West Brookfield,	Jan. 5, 1853	
Hubbard Beebe,	W. C.	Sturbridge,	April 20, 1853	Rem. Oct. 24, 1854.
Israel H. Northrup,	—	Warren,	April 20, 1853	Rem. April 13, 1854.
Stephen S. Smith,	—	Warren,	June 14, 1854	
Horace R. Grannis,	O. C.	Holland,	Aug. 1, 1854	Rem. Jan. —, 1856.
David Perry,	D. C.	Brookfield,	Aug. 1, 1854	
Isaac G. Bliss,	A. C.	Southbridge,	Aug. 1, 1854	Removed — 1856.
James T. Hyde,	Y. C.	New Braintree,	Aug. 2, 1854	Rem. Aug. 28, 1855.
Levi F. Waldo,	U. C.	North Brookfield,	Oct. 3, 1854	Cut off, Aug. 5, '56.
John Cunningham,	—	Southbridge (Globe Village),	Jan. 2, 1855	
Stephen G. Dodd,	P. C.	Spencer,	Jan. 3, 1855	
Ariel E. P. Perkins,	A. C.	Ware Village,	Jan. 1, 1856	
Seth W. Banister,	A. C.	Ware, 1st Parish,	April 15, 1856	
John H. Gurney,	O. C.	New Braintree,	Aug. 5, 1856	
Sumner G. Clapp,	Y. C.	Sturbridge,	Oct. 8, 1856	
Francis Wood,	B. U.	Holland,	Oct. 8, 1856	

3. *Preachers before various Organizations, with the Date.**Before the General Association of Massachusetts.*

- |                                |                                 |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1813. Rev. Thomas Snell, D. D. | 1857. Rev. Christopher Cushing. |
| 1833. Rev. Joseph Vaill, D. D. |                                 |

*Before the Auxiliary Foreign Missionary Society.*

- |                                |                              |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1824. Rev. Thomas Snell, D. D. | 1827. Rev. Alvan Bond, D. D. |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|

*Before the Auxiliary Domestic Missionary Society.*

- |                              |                         |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1826. Rev. John Fiske, D. D. | 1827. Rev. Micah Stone. |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|

*Before the Society for the Mutual Assistance of the Churches.*

- |                                 |                              |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1828. Rev. Thomas Snell, D. D.  | 1843. Rev. Nahum Gale, D. D. |
| 1829. " Joseph I. Foot, D. D.   | 1844. " James Kimball.       |
| 1830. " Parsons Cooke, D. D.    | 1845. " Leonard S. Parker.   |
| 1831. " Levi Packard.           | 1846. " George Trask.        |
| 1832. " John Wilder.            | 1847. " David N. Coburn.     |
| 1833. " Martyn Tupper.          | 1848. " Joshua Bates, D. D.  |
| 1834. " Augustus B. Reed.       | 1849. " Nelson Clark.        |
| 1835. " Samuel Backus.          | 1850. " Charles Smith.       |
| 1836. " Joseph S. Clark, D. D.  | 1851. " Asa Mann.            |
| 1837. " Caleb B. Tracy.         | 1852. " Theron G. Colton.    |
| 1838. " Samuel A. Fay.          | 1853. " Hubbard Beebe.       |
| 1839. " Jonathan E. Woodbridge. | 1854. " Jesse K. Bragg.      |
| 1840. " Joseph S. Clark, D. D.  | 1855. " Isaac G. Bliss.      |
| 1841. " John Fiske, D. D.       | 1856. " Stephen S. Smith.    |
| 1842. " Eber Carpenter.         | 1857. " Jason Morse.         |

*Before the Brookfield Associational Conference.<sup>1</sup>*

- |                             |                             |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1821. Rev. Micah Stone.     | 1824. Rev. Joseph Blodget.  |
| 1822. " Alvan Bond, D. D.   | 1825. " Joshua Crosby.      |
| 1823. " Joseph Vaill, D. D. | 1826. " Joseph Vaill, D. D. |

<sup>1</sup> The *Brookfield Conference* is anomalous. On the 27th of September, 1820, the Brookfield Association unanimously passed the following resolutions:—

"*Resolved*, That this Association will invite each of the churches in our connection to send a delegate annually to our meeting in June, to deliberate and act with this body upon all matters that may come before them relating to church order and discipline; and that questions for discussion respecting subjects of this nature be reserved to that meeting."

On the 16th of June, 1826, they voted to organize a conference of churches, and on the 10th of June, 1828, the organization was perfected by the adoption of a constitution. The conference is called "The Brookfield Associational Conference," and is so identified with the Association itself that its annual meeting takes the place of the original June meeting of the Association, and the records of both bodies are kept by the same person and in the same book.

It has existed in *fact* from June 13, 1821, and met regularly every year, but did not take its present *constitutional form* until June 10, 1828.

1827.	Rev. Daniel Tomlinson.	1843.	Rev. Moses K. Cross.
1828.	" Joseph I. Foot, D. D.	1844.	" Levi Packard.
1829.	" John Wilder.	1845.	" John Keep.
1830.	" Micah Stone.	1846.	" Asa Mann.
1831.	" Jason Park.	1847.	" Thomas Snell, D. D.
1832.	" Martyn Tupper.	1848.	" Washington A. Nichols.
1833.	" Francis Horton.	1849.	{ " Samuel Hutchings.
1834.	" Joseph Vaill, D. D.		{ " Leonard S. Parker.
1835.	" Joseph S. Clark, D. D.	1850.	" Moses Miller.
1836.	" Caleb B. Tracy.	1851.	" Levi Packard.
1837.	{ " Micah Stone.	1852.	" Jason Morse.
	{ " George Trask.	1853.	" Christopher Cushing.
1838.	" Isaac R. Barbour.	1854.	" James T. Hyde.
1839.	" Joseph Vaill, D. D.	1855.	" Stephen G. Dodd.
1840.	" Eber Carpenter.	1856.	" John Haven.
1841.	" Barnabas M. Fay.		" John Keep.
1842.	" George C. Beckwith, D. D.	1857.	{ " William H. Beecher.

4. *Names of those who were approbated by this Association to preach the Gospel, together with the Date of their Licensure.*

Name.	College.	Licensure.
1. Ebenezer Moseley, . . .	Y. C. . .	June 19, 1765.
2. Aaron Bascomb, . . .	— . .	March 9, 1769.
3. Joseph Patrick, . . .	Y. C. . .	October 31, 1770.
4. Joseph Avery, . . .	H. C. . .	August 25, 1773.
5. William May, . . .	D. C. . .	May 22, 1776.
6. Cornelius Lynde, . . .	H. C. . .	September 2, 1778.
7. Walter Lyon, . . .	D. C. . .	January 10, 1779.
8. Joshua Paine, Jr., . . .	H. C. . .	January 25, 1786.
9. Elisha Moseley, . . .	D. C. . .	November 2, 1791.
10. James Tufts, . . .	B. U. . .	May 2, 1792.
11. Calvin Chadwick, . . .	D. C. . .	May 2, 1792.
12. Thaddeus Fairbanks, . . .	Y. C. . .	September 24, 1800.
13. Edwards Whipple, . . .	W. C. . .	April 27, 1803.
14. David Dickinson, . . .	D. C. . .	April 27, 1803.
15. Luther Wilson, . . .	W. C. . .	April 27, 1808.
16. Ralph W. Gridley, . . .	Y. C. . .	September 20, 1815.
17. Thomas Adams, . . .	D. C. . .	September 18, 1816.
18. Josiah Clark, . . .	W. C. . .	January 1, 1817.
19. Cyrus P. Grosvenor, . . .	D. C. . .	April 17, 1822.
20. Caleb S. Henry, . . .	D. C. . .	January 2, 1828.
21. William Wolcott, . . .	B. C. . .	June 3, 1830.
22. Samuel Hopkins, . . .	D. C. . .	April 20, 1831.
23. Robert T. Conant, . . .	A. C. . .	October 6, 1840.
24. William B. Stone, . . .	A. C. . .	August 4, 1841.
25. Lyman Whiting, . . .	— . .	April 20, 1842.

	Name.	College.	Licentiate.
26.	Darius Gore, . . . .	A. C. . . .	August 3, 1842.
27.	Calvin Terry, . . . .	A. C. . . .	" " "
28.	Thomas S. Vaill, . . . .	A. C. . . .	" " "
29.	John B. Allen, . . . .	U. C. . . .	October 5, 1842.
30.	Samuel H. Allen, . . . .	A. C. . . .	April 16, 1844.
31.	Isaac D. Day, . . . .	A. C. . . .	August 14, 1844.
32.	William Goodwin, . . . .	— . . . .	" " "
33.	Warren C. Fiske, . . . .	A. C. . . .	" " "
34.	Frederick H. Pitkin, . . . .	A. C. . . .	" " "
35.	Albert Paine, . . . .	Y. C. . . .	October 2, 1844.
36.	Edward Webb, . . . .	— . . . .	January 8, 1845.
37.	Charles E. Bruce, . . . .	A. C. . . .	August 4, 1847.
38.	Levi A. Field, . . . .	A. C. . . .	April 18, 1849.
39.	Jason Morse, . . . .	A. C. . . .	" " "
40.	Salem M. Plimpton, . . . .	A. C. . . .	" " "
41.	Charles H. Pierce, . . . .	O. C. . . .	April 17, 1850.
42.	Lewis Gano, . . . .	— . . . .	August 6, 1851.
43.	David Burt, . . . .	O. C. . . .	April 16, 1851.
44.	Ogden Hall, . . . .	— . . . .	February 3, 1857.

5. *The Questions discussed, and the Date of their Adoption.*

1. March 3, 1779. — How far a minister's power extends of baptizing or admitting persons into the Church *ex officio*, or without consulting a particular church?
2. February 27, 1782. — How are baptized persons to be considered and treated?
3. October 29, 1783. — In what relation do baptized youth stand to a church?
4. September 25, 1793. — Who are the proper subjects of church discipline, and what is the proper mode of procedure with them?
5. August 13, 1794. — In what point of light are baptized children to be viewed by the Church?
6. April 29, 1795. — Ought church-members guilty of scandal to be required to make confession before the Church only?
7. April 27, 1796. — Can any reason be given why the violation of one command in the decalogue should be publicly confessed more than another?
8. January 5, 1803. — Shall candidates for admission into this Association be examined?
9. September 27, 1809. — How ought the churches to treat baptized persons?
10. January 6, 1813. — Is it proper for a minister of the gospel to be connected and act with two different associations at the same time?
11. April 19, 1815. — What did the Apostles require candidates for church-membership to believe; or what profession of faith did the Apostles require of persons for baptism? Acts viii. 37.
12. September 18, 1816. — Are there not offences in the church for which the offender may be immediately tried and excommunicated by the Church as a body, without taking the several steps mentioned by Christ in the eighteenth chapter of Matthew? 1 Cor. v.

13. January 1, 1817. — Has Christ, as the constituted Head of the Church, delegated, in any sense, the power of judging to the visible Church, and if so, how far, and in what manner is this power to be exercised?
14. Has He delegated this power to individuals, whether ministers or private Christians, in such a sense, that they have a right to decide in regard to the religious character of churches, or individuals, and to regulate their conduct, either by extending or withholding fellowship according to their private judgment?
15. June 16, 1819. — What is the meaning of the word "sect"?
16. What is conviction?
17. Does conviction always precede a change of heart?
18. October 20, 1819. — What are the rights of Congregational churches relative to the town or parish as respects the choice of religious teachers?
19. Ought recommendations to be given to those who request them, in order to join Baptist churches?
20. Must objections to receiving a person into the Church by certificate be such as would subject the person to discipline from the church to which he belongs, and is it the duty of the objector to institute a process against him?
21. January 5, 1820. — What shall be done with a person who leaves a Congregational church and joins the Baptists?
22. Is not Antinomianism among the prevailing and alarming errors of the present time?
23. Is a second baptism under any circumstances justifiable?
24. April 19, 1820. — In case a church should wish to introduce a new Covenant or Confession of Faith, where a minority is opposed to the measure, what is the most suitable method to be adopted in order to effect the object?
25. June 14, 1820. — A member of one of our churches has joined a Baptist society and obtained a certificate: does this affect his relation to the Church, and if so, in what manner?
26. September 27, 1820. — Is it expedient for a minister of the Gospel to exchange with other ministers of any denomination, who are assisting in building up a separate church within his society?
27. Will the Association take any measures for the formation of a young men's religious charitable society in this county?
28. April 18, 1821. — What are the causes of that laxness of discipline which prevails in our churches?
29. What are the best remedies for laxness of church discipline?
30. What is the object of church discipline?
31. Whose duty is it to commence a course of discipline with an offending brother?
32. April 17, 1822. — What is the duty of churches with respect to the dismissing and recommending of members?
33. What is the duty of churches in receiving members from other churches?
34. What are the existing evils which threaten the peace and prosperity of our churches?



35. What are the means of guarding against those evils?
36. What are the different kinds of censure which a church may pass upon its members?
37. June 19, 1822. — Is it expedient for the Association to recommend to the churches in our connection to adopt a uniform confession of faith and church covenant?
38. What is the duty of a church when application is made by persons in a neighboring town or society to unite with it, upon the plea that the minister where they belong is immoral and heretical, and the church of such a character that they cannot in conscience unite with it, provided the church thus applied to has reason to believe the plea founded in truth?
39. April 16, 1823. — Can ministers do anything — and if anything, what — to counteract the efforts which are made at the present day to disseminate error?
40. September 17, 1823. — What are the causes of the present low state of religion in our societies?
41. Can we do anything more than we are now doing — and if anything, what — to counteract these causes?
42. Is it expedient to continue the delegation from our churches at the June meetings of the Association?
43. April 21, 1824. — In what manner ought professors of religion to train up their children?
44. Is it the duty of the Church to see that her members train up their children as they ought? and if so, how shall the Church discharge this duty?
45. Ought the children of Christian professors, deceased, to be baptized? and if so, by whom to be dedicated?
46. Ought our churches to maintain a more familiar intercourse with each other? and if so, in what manner?
47. How may the spirit of religion be kept alive in our churches?
48. October 4, 1826. — Are all the affections of the unregenerate sinful?
49. January 7, 1829. — Are any special efforts required — and if so, what — to produce in *young men* a deeper interest on the subject of religious instruction?
50. October 14, 1829. — What changes did the Babylonian captivity produce in the religious opinions and character of the Jews?
51. January 7, 1830. — Was temporal or spiritual death any part of the penalty of the divine law?
52. October 6, 1830. — How can we reconcile the frequent prayers of David, that God would destroy his enemies, with the idea that he then possessed true benevolence of heart?
53. April 18, 1832. — What is the meaning of those Scriptures which speak of Christ's coming after his ascension?
54. Is Unitarian baptism valid?
55. October 5, 1832. — Is public controversy among Orthodox ministers expedient under existing circumstances?
56. April 17, 1833. — Have the prophecies of Scripture ever a double meaning?
57. Do mankind enter immediately at death upon happiness or misery? if so, why is the resurrection represented as desirable?

58. January 1, 1834. — What is the meaning of the word "heart," as used in Scripture?
59. April 16, 1834. — What are the causes of the frequent dismission of ministers?
60. October 1, 1834. — Are there any prophecies in Scripture which were designedly left unintelligible to the cotemporaries of the prophets, but capable of being understood in later ages?
61. What is remorse of conscience?
62. January 5, 1835. — Ought there to be a change in the article of wine at the communion?
63. Is baptism a Scriptural requisition for admission to church communion?
64. What is the evidence that the Apostles were inspired when they wrote?
65. April 15, 1835. — Would a person having the Spirit of Christ readily admit the divinity of Christ?
66. What are we to understand by the words, "The Spirit helpeth our infirmities with groanings that cannot be uttered"?
67. Does not the Bible sanction the practice of giving thanks after meals?
68. October 7, 1835. — What ought the churches to do in their present state to promote the cause of religion? What ought ministers to do in promotion of the same object?
69. January 5, 1836. — How far are the promises made to the Apostles applicable to their successors?
70. April 20, 1836. — Does the miracle of turning water into wine furnish any argument for the present use of wine?
71. October 5, 1836. — What is meant by our promoting the glory of God?
72. January 3, 1837. — What are the duties, privileges, and responsibilities of the senior pastor of a church?
73. Should "Moral Reform Societies" receive our countenance and aid?
74. April 19, 1837. — Ought Orthodox ministers to appoint Unitarians to preach the annual convention sermon?
75. October 4, 1837. — What is the duty of a pastor in relation to one who brings a letter of recommendation, but says he feels unfit to be in the Church?
76. January 3, 1838. — Is it expedient to admit persons to the Church who do not believe in infant baptism?
77. What shall be done with members of other churches, residing among us, who refuse to support the gospel?
78. Should the elements of the Lord's Supper be refused to a Unitarian member who wishes to commune with us?
79. April 15, 1838. — What advantages are afforded by installation above "stated supply"?
80. Can a person adopt any measures on the Sabbath to secure a debt, without a breach of the Sabbath?
81. Do ministers and Christians obey the precept "be courteous" when they speak of each other without some title of respect or affection?
82. June 12, 1838. — What measures shall be adopted to draw people to the house of God?

83. August 1, 1838. — Does a Christian minister's success essentially depend on his fidelity ?
84. Ought ministers of the gospel to go to the polls in order to assist in sustaining the law of the last Legislature, repealing the license laws ?
85. Is it consistent for a church to admit those as members who deny *any one* article of the Confession of Faith ?
86. Is there a promise in our church covenant by the members that they will offer their children in baptism ?
87. Is doctrinal preaching the best practical preaching ?
88. October 3, 1838. — Why are not funeral exercises more generally attended with religious benefit ?
89. What are the duties of clergymen to common schools ?
90. In what, and how, does the condition of the dead between death and the resurrection differ from what it will be after the resurrection ?
91. January 9, 1839. — In what does the suspension of a church-member differ from excommunication ?
92. What is the duty of a church towards a suspended member ?
93. To what extent are the precepts of the Pentateuch now in force ?
94. April 16, 1839. — What peculiarly distinguishes the Apocrypha from the canonical books of Scripture ?
95. August 6, 1839. — Does the fact that God has given laws concerning a relation and condition of man prove that relation and condition to be right ?
96. January 7, 1840. — What is the duty of those pastors who do not sympathize with Abolition agents as to inviting them to preach on the Sabbath ?
97. What is the duty of a minister who has serious objections to protracted meetings, when the question of having such a meeting, as the only means of securing the conversion of men, is agitated in his church ?
98. What is the great reason that our ministry is attended with no better success ?
99. June 9. — What are the obligations of professing Christians as to the support of the institutions of religion ?
100. To what extent are the churches responsible for the existence of a revival of religion in their midst ?
101. August 4, 1840. — Is it right to aid a slave who has escaped from his master in going to a land of freedom ?
102. January 5, 1841. — Ought a minister in the midst of difficulties which he cannot remove, to take steps to dissolve the connection between him and his people, when there is not disaffection to call for it ?
103. April 20, 1841. — Is it consistent for ministers of Jesus Christ to attend funerals when Universalist preachers officiate ?
104. Is the Colonization Society worthy of patronage ?
105. Should action be taken against a church-member who is affirmed by another member, in open meeting, to have injured him ?
106. What shall be done with a member of the Church who withdraws from communion on the assigned reason that he has no religion ?
107. What ought ministers and churches to do with members of other churches residing among them who are guilty of misdemeanors ?
108. August 3, 1841. — Are deacons to be ordained ? and if so, by whom ?

109. January 4, 1842. — What is the duty of the Orthodox clergy of this State, at their approaching convention, in respect to those members who have avowed their disbelief of the Bible as a revelation from God?
110. What shall be done with a member of the Church who objects to creeds, — is a perfectionist, — and does not hold to civil government, or the rights of private property?
111. August 2, 1842. — Is the common use of tobacco an evil? if so, how is it to be remedied in the community?
112. October 4, 1842. — Is the millennium to come *before* or *after* the end of the world?
113. April 18, 1843. — What shall be done with members of the Church who absent themselves from communion, but who sustain fair moral characters?
114. August 2, 1843. — Ought anything more to be done than is doing to enlighten and save the Roman Catholics of this country? and if so, what?
115. Are we to believe anything we do not understand?
116. January 2, 1844. — What ought ministers to do upon the subject of temperance?
117. What should be done with members of our churches who leave their covenant relations in an irregular manner?
118. August 13, 1844. — What shall be done with a church-member who removes to a distance, lives in the midst of Orthodox churches, but declines asking or taking a letter of dismission in order to unite with a sister church, and against whose moral character there is no objection, and who, in his own way, seems to be trying to do good?
119. October 1, 1844. — Is it desirable that New England, in the collection of funds for charitable objects, should confine herself within her own limits?
120. March 4, 1845. — Is any change in respect to the state of Congregational discipline desirable? if so, is it practicable?
121. Is it practicable and expedient to attempt to carry into effect the general plan contained in the manual of discipline proposed by the State Committee appointed at a meeting of Congregational ministers, held in Boston, May 29, 1844?
122. October 7, 1845. — Is it right, in any case, to receive a slaveholder into a Christian church?
123. Do the Scriptures authorize us to assign reasons why God withholds the converting influences of his Spirit?
124. April 21, 1846. — Shall the basis of organization of the General Association be so modified as to admit of a lay delegation in this body equal to the clerical delegation?
125. October 6, 1846. — Is all war inconsistent with the principles of Christianity?
126. January 5, 1847. — Is it best that the Convention sermon be discontinued?
127. August 3, 1847. — What are the distinct points of difference between humanity and benevolence?
128. January 4, 1848. — Should the votes of churches regarding the excommunication of members be read publicly before the church and congregation on the Sabbath?
129. Do the difficulties of Scripture weaken its credibility?

130. April 18, 1848. — What is error in religion ?
131. August 1, 1848. — What is included in the promises of the Abrahamic covenant ?
132. April 17, 1849. — Is the future state of infants a matter of revelation ?
133. June 12, 1849. — Is it right for a member of a church to sign off from the society ?
134. Is a member of the church who signs off from the society, and does not pay his proportion for the support of the gospel, guilty of a disciplinary offence ?
135. Is a member of the church guilty of a disciplinary offence who signs off from the society, but pays his full proportion of supporting the gospel and all contingent expenses ?
136. July 31, 1849. — Do pastoral duties occupy as much attention as their importance demands ?
137. What is to be understood by the prayer of faith ?
138. October 2, 1849. — Do the Scriptures teach that the probation of man will cease at death ?
139. Are the declarations found in Revelation xx. 4 to be understood literally ?
140. April 16, 1850. — How shall ministers influence young men so as to attach them to the institutions of the gospel ?
141. July 30, 1850. — How shall religious newspapers best advance the interests of Christianity ?
142. August 5, 1851. — What is conscience, and what its office ?
143. January 6, 1852. — Is suffering in this world designed to be punitive or only disciplinary ?
144. October 5, 1852. — Is conviction of sin in all cases the work of the Holy Spirit ?
145. January 4, 1853. — How does the atonement satisfy conscience ?
146. April 19, 1853. — How can the costliness of Solomon's Temple be reconciled with the economico-missionary spirit of this age ?
147. August 1, 1854. — What is the Bible view of the final condition of the earth ?
148. January 3, 1855. — Is the distinction between common and special influences of the Holy Spirit Scriptural ?
149. April 17, 1855. — Are there any truths which may be addressed *directly* to the heart in distinction from the intellect ?
150. August 14, 1855. — Is it expedient to attempt further co-operation in Home Missionary operations between Congregationalists and Presbyterians ?
151. January 2, 1856. — Did the Divine Nature suffer in the atonement of Christ ?
152. October 7, 1856. — Is it expedient to continue the correspondence between the Massachusetts General Association and the General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church ?

6. *Themes of Essays, and the Date of their Adoption.*

1. October 7, 1835. — The Preacher's choosing out Acceptable Words.
2. June 14, 1836. — The Prayer of Faith.

3. January 3, 1837. — A Revival of Religion, — the Nature of the Excitement which it involves.
4. October 4, 1837. — The Bible Views of Slavery.
5. January 3, 1838. — Peace.
6. April 15, 1838. — Election.
7. April 21, 1840. — Creeds.
8. January 5, 1841. — The Claims of the Colonization Society.
9. April 20, 1841. — The Deficiency of Moral and Religious Instruction in Common Schools.
10. January 4, 1842. — Mormonism.
11. April 19, 1842. — The Millennium.
12. August 2, 1842. — The Westminster Assembly's Catechism.
13. January 3, 1843. — Universalism, how to be met.
14. April 18, 1843. — The Trinity.
15. October 3, 1843. — Unity in Sermons.
16. January 2, 1844. — The Relations of a Minister of Jesus Christ to Civil Government.
17. April 16, 1844. — The Grounds of Moral Obligation.
18. August 13, 1844. — Wood's Objections to Episcopacy.
19. October 1, 1844. — Church Government.
20. January 7, 1845. — Bush on the Resurrection.
21. April 22, 1845. — The Duty of Christians particularly in Relation to Benevolent Objects.
22. The Resurrection.
23. August 5, 1845. — Secret Societies.
24. January 6, 1846. — "Organic Sins."
25. April 21, 1846. — Doctrinal Preaching.
26. August 4, 1846. — The Perseverance of the Saints.
27. January 5, 1847. — Probation.
28. April 20, 1847. — A Permanent Ministry.
29. October 5, 1847. — The Corporal Punishment of Children.
30. October 4, 1848. — The Union of Christ with Believers.
31. January 2, 1849. — The Salvation of Infants.
32. April 17, 1849. — Pastoral Duties.
33. January 1, 1850. — The Temptation of Christ.
34. October 1, 1850. — The State of the Churches in Brookfield Association Fifty Years ago.
35. January 7, 1851. — The Influence of Calvinism on Civil Liberty.
36. October 5, 1851. — Fairs for Moral and Religious Purposes.
37. August 3, 1852. — The Gospel Terms of Communion.
38. January 4, 1853. — Stuart's Introduction to the Book of Ecclesiastes.
39. August 1, 1854. — "The Conflict of Ages."
40. January 3, 1855. — The Literal Restoration of the Jews to Palestine.
41. January 2, 1856. — Lyceums.
42. August 5, 1856. — Satanic influence. (Eph. ii. 2.)
43. February 2, 1857. — The Theory of Inspiration as applied to the Book of Ecclesiastes.

7. *Texts for Exegesis, and the Year of their Selection.*

1795. Rom. ix. 3; James i. 13-15. 1841. Ps. ii. 7; 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35; Luke xxi. 32.
1796. Matt. xxiv. 34, 35. 1842. Rev. v. 13; Gal. v. 18; Rev. x. 5, 6.
1799. 1 Pet. i. 17. 1843. Rev. xx. 4, 5; Is. xxviii. 16.
1803. 2 Pet. ii. 1. 1844. Heb. vi. 4-6; Prov. xxvii. 19; Rom. viii. 29.
1804. 1 Cor. vi. 9; Gal. iii. 19; Eccl. xii. 7. 1845. Matt. xviii. 15-17; 2 Tim. iii. 13; Gen. viii. 21; Canticles ii. 1.
1805. 2 Pet. iii. 9; John xii. 28. 1846. Rom. v. 6; 1 Pet. iv. 1; Heb. x. 26, 27; Matt. vii. 6; 1 Pet. iii. 18.
1806. John xi. 24; 1 Cor. ix. 22. 1847. 1 John v. 20; 1 Pet. iii. 19; Prov. xiii. 24; 1 Pet. iv. 6.
1807. 1 Tim. ii. 4; Luke xxi. 8; John iii. 3. 1848. 1 Pet. iii. 21; Job iv. 18; John xv. 5; 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2.
1808. James iv. 7; Matt. vii. 7; Prov. xvi. 9. 1849. 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Gal. v. 18; Matt. iv. 8, 9.
1809. Luke xix. 14; Prov. xiv. 12; Heb. xi. 1, 13, 18, 2d clause. 1850. Rom. viii. 20; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15; Job i. 6; Gen. xxxii. 24; Gen. ix. 6.
1810. 1 Pet. iv. 6. 1851. Ezek. xiv. 9; Prov. xvi. 4; Luke ii. 14.
1814. Mark ii. 27; Matt. xiii. 10, 11. 1852. 1 Tim. i. 15; 2 Cor. xii. 16.
1815. Acts viii. 37. 1853. 1 Cor. xv. 29; Heb. iv. 12.
1816. Heb. iv. 7-10. 1854. 1 Cor. xv. 28; Rev. xx. 6.
1818. Luke xxiii. 34; 1 Tim. iv. 15. 1855. Rom. xi. 12, 15; John iii. 8; John xix. 11.
1826. 1 Cor. iii. 12-15. 1856. Rom. v. 18; John vi. 44; Luke xxii. 53.
1827. Eph. vi. 12. 1857. Rom. v. 18, 19; 1 Cor. vii. 14.
1835. Matt. xix. 28.
1836. John ii. 1-10; Ps. cx.
1837. Rom. v. 19; Gal. iii. 29.
1838. 1 Tim. iv. 16; Jude 4; Matt. xi. 12; Matt. v. 37, 38.
1839. 1 Sam. x. 6, 9, 10, 11; Job i. 6-12; Rom. viii. 7; Ps. ii. 8, 9.
1840. Matt. iii. 11; Rom. vi. 7; Heb. vi. 4-6.

8. *Texts for Plans of Sermons, and the Year of their Selection.*

1840. Matt. xxiii. 19; Acts xxiv. 25. 1847. Ps. xiv. 4; Matt. iv. 1-11; Heb. x. 12; Rom. x. 8, 9.
1841. Acts xxvi. 28; Eph. ii. 8. 1848. 1 Pet. i. 5; John vii. 17; Acts xx. 21; Rom. i. 16.
1842. Luke iv. 28, 29; Eph. i. 4; Rom. ix. 18. 1849. Rev. xxi. 5; Heb. v. 9; Col. i. 29.
1843. Ps. cxii. 7; Matt. xxii. 2; Heb. vi. 4-6; Prov. xvii. 16. 1850. 2 Pet. iii. 11; 2 Kings iv. 26.
1844. Phil. ii. 12, 13; Ps. ix. 19; Rom. ii. 5; Matt. vii. 6. 1851. James i. 18.
1845. Rom. i. 16; 2 Tim. iii. 13; Acts ii. 37. 1852. Eph. i. 4; Ps. cx. 3; John x. 16.
1846. 1 John iii. 8; Prov. v. 22; Deut. xxvii. 26. 1853. (Prov. xxvii. 6; and Heb. xii. 3;) Eph. ii. 3.
1856. Neh. iv. 6; Is. i. 10, 11.
1857. John xvii. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 22.



9. — *Texts from which Sermons were preached, and the Year.*

1757. Ps. xxxii. 5; Ezek. xxii. 30; Zeph. i. 15.
1763. Jam. ii. 10; John xi. 35; Matt. xvi. 24; Gal. iv. 18.
1764. Ex. xxxiii. 15; Col. i. 20; Matt. v. 47; 1 Cor. iv. 2; Job iv. 7; Ps. cxix. 37; Eph. ii. 1.
1765. 1 Pet. ii. 21; Ps. i. 1-3.
1766. Ps. xcvii. 1.
1768. Acts xvii. 30; Rom. xv. 30; Heb. ii. 1; 3 John 4.
1769. 2 Tim. ii. 19; Gen. xxviii. 12.
1770. Rev. i. 6; Job xxvii. 6; Rom. viii. 32; 2 Cor. v. 18.
1771. 1 John iii. 3; Is. lv. 10, 11; Job xxviii. 28; Luke xiii. 25.
1772. Eph. iii. 8; Rom. v. 6; Ps. cxxxix. 23, 24.
1773. Rom. vi. 15; Acts xx. 24; Ps. xlviii. 14; Phil. i. 21.
1774. Ps. li. 6.
1775. Ezek. xxxiii. 12; Ps. lxxix. 8, 9; Ps. xxxii. 6; 1 Tim. iv. 16; Job xxxviii. 17.
1776. Ps. li. 18; Is. xxvi. 9; Is. v. 1-6; Is. iii. 10; Is. lxii. 1.
1777. 2 Sam. vii. 18; Is. xlviii. 18.
1778. Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke vi. 46; James i. 2-8.
1779. John viii. 31; Rom. xii. 19; 2 Cor. v. 20; John i. 39; 1 Cor. xi. 26.
1780. Ps. cxix. 18; Is. liii. 1; 2 Cor. v. 20; Matt. xi. 6; 1 John iii. 9.
1781. Matt. xvi. 26; Ex. xx. 13; (Matt. x. 16, 17; and 2 Cor. xi. 13;) 2 Cor. i. 12; 2 Cor. v. 20; Ps. cxix. 115; Job vi. 44; Acts ii. 21; Acts xx. 24; Luke iv. 28-30.
1782. 1 Kings xxii. 19-22; 2 Cor. vi. 1; 2 Cor. iv. 7; Acts x. 43; Titus iii. 8; Heb. iii. 12; Rev. iii. 21; Mal. iii. 17.
1783. Acts xvi. 30; 2 Pet. ii. 2; Heb. vi. 18; 1 Cor. ii. 2; (1 Tim. vi. 3-5, also John x. 11 and Ps. xxiii. 1;) Gal. ii. 20; Phil. i. 6; Is. liii. 1; Ps. lxxiii. 1.
1784. Acts xix. 20; Luke xxiv. 32; John i. 17; John xv. 14; Eph. iii. 15; Job xxii. 2, 3; Gen. xvii. 1, 2.
1785. Acts xix. 15; (John x. 11 and Ps. xxi. 1;) Rom. xiv. 7, 8; Rom. v. 2; Ps. cxix. 57; Jer. xiii. 23; Jer. xx. 9; Job xxii. 21.
1786. Jer. v. 31; Phil. i. 27; John viii. 39; Matt. vii. 7; Ps. xxi. 9; Rev. ii. 5; Acts xx. 20; Jude 3.
1787. Ps. cxxxiii. 1; Heb. x. 24; Phil. i. 6; John xi. 4; Prov. xv. 24.
1788. Acts xv. 18; Is. i. 1.
1789. Rom. iii. 31; Rom. vi. 22; Ezek. xlvii. 11; Is. liii. 1.
1790. Prov. xxiii. 17, 18; Rom. xii. 11.
1791. Rom. xii. 11; John iii. 19; Acts xviii. 5.
1792. Col. i. 12; 1 Chron. xv. 16, 22; John i. 14; Jer. iv. 3.
1793. Hos. x. 12; Prov. xxvii. 19; Matt. vi. 33.
1794. Ps. iv. 4; John xviii. 36; Phil. iii. 14.
1795. 1 Thess. iv. 1; Titus i. 5.
1796. John xiv. 15; Ezek. iii. 17, 18, 19; 1 Thess. v. 19.
1797. Job xii. 10; 2 Cor. v. 17; Prov. xxix. 25.
1798. Ps. cxliii. 8; Matt. xviii. 3.
1800. Jer. viii. 14; 1 Pet. i. 17; Eccl. xii. 14.
1801. Matt. iv. 17; Rom. viii. 1; Luke xix. 22.
1802. Phil. i. 6; Eph. ii. 10.
1803. Eph. ii. 12; Matt. xix. 6; Jude 3.
1804. 2 Pet. ii. 1; Matt. v. 3; John i. 17.

1805. Eccl. xii. 7; John xii. 39, 40.
1806. Gen. xiii. 17; Matt. xiii. 30; 1 Cor. ix. 22.
1807. Micah iv. 13; Ps. cxlix. 12, 13; 2 John 4.
1808. 2 Thess. iii. 1; Eccl. xii. 1-7; Prov. xxvii. 11.
1809. Heb. ix. 16; Eccl. xii. 1; John xxi. 15-17; Luke ii. 52.
1810. Acts xxvii. 31; Ex. xvi. 15; Rom. ii. 21; 2 Cor. v. 20; Prov. viii. 17.
1811. Rom. x. 1; 1 Cor. iii. 6, 7; Ps. xxxiv. 11; Ezek. ii. 8; Neh. ix. 6.
1812. Matt. xi. 12; Dan. vii. 18.
1813. Ps. cxix. 89; 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17; Is. liii. 1.
1814. 1 Cor. xiv. 8; John xvi. 33; 2 Kings vii. 4; Matt. xiii. 10, 11.
1815. Matt. xix. 6; John xvii. 1; 1 Cor. i. 23.
1816. Acts iv. 12; Heb. vi. 1; Ps. xxv. 14; John i. 18; Ezek. xxxvii. 3-6; Is. lxvi. 2; Josh. xxiv. 10.
1817. 1 Cor. iii. 6; Matt. vii. 24; 1 Thess. ii. 17; Rom. v. 1; 2 Cor. x. 4; 1 Cor. iii. 1; 1 Cor. xiv. 8; Matt. vii. 18.
1818. Heb. xiii. 17; Matt. xxiii. 34; Rev. ii. 10; Acts viii. 26; 1 Thess. ii. 19, 20; Prov. xxiii. 23; 2 Cor. iii. 6; Rom. xi. 24.
1819. Rev. ii. 10; Gal. vi. 9; Ezek. ii. 7; Prov. xix. 21; 1 Sam. xxiii. 16, 17; Gen. xxviii. 16; 2 Cor. ii. 15, 16; Is. lv. 8.
1820. 2 John x. 10, 11; Col. ii. 15; Heb. xiii. 17; John vi. 44; 2 Thess. ii. 11; Ezek. xlvi. 35; Rom. v. 1.
1821. 1 Cor. xv. 14; 1 Pet. iv. 7; Num. xvi. 3; 1 Cor. v. 6; Gen. xviii. 25.
1822. Jer. xxiii. 22; John iii. 8; Matt. vi. 22, 23; Rom. i. 16; Rom. i. 16 again.
1823. Rom. x. 1; Matt. xxv. 14; Jude 21; Prov. xxvii. 16; Prov. xxx. 12; Acts xx. 30; Acts xvii. 31.
1824. Luke ix. 62; 2 Cor. iv. 5; Luke vi. 37; Acts xvi. 31; Acts vii. 55, 56; Rom. ix. 21.
1825. Acts xvii. 6, last clause; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Rom. vii. 24; Titus ii. 13; Col. i. 28; Josh. i. 7.
1826. 1 Cor. ix. 27; Is. xl. 1; Mark viii. 37; Ps. cxxxvii. 5, 6; Acts xv. 36; Num. xxiii. 11.
1827. Heb. ii. 6; 1 Cor. viii. 13; Ps. lxxxi. 12; 1 Thess. v. 17; Gal. vi. 10; Ps. li. 12, 13.
1828. Rom. xiii. 11; Prov. xxiii. 32; Col. i. 28; Jer. xxiii. 17; Acts xx. 35; Heb. xi. 7; Eph. vi. 10.
1829. Mal. iii. 10; Rom. xiv. 5; Matt. x. 13; Is. xlix. 13-18; John xvii. 20, 21; Rom. iii. 19.
1830. John iii. 3; Eph. i. 7, last clause; Acts xvi. 28; Jude 20, 21; Is. lv. 8.
1831. James iv. 14; 2 Cor. xi. 15, 16; Is. lv. 12, 13.
1832. Dan. x. 19; Luke xiii. 13; Acts iv. 13; Ex. xxiv. 7; 1 Thess. i. 4; Ex. xxxiii. 18, 19; Matt. v. 48.
1833. John iii. 20; 1 Cor. xiii. 12; 2 Pet. iii. 10; Acts i. 8; Luke xix. 13.
1834. Eccl. vii. 13; Heb. iii. 19; John vii. 48; Gal. vi. 4; Acts ix. 31; Acts ii. 1; Job i. ix.
1835. Matt. x. 3-6; John ix. 4; Acts iv. 19; Matt. v. 13.
1836. Luke xix. 13; 1 Cor. i. 23, 24; 1 Cor. ix. 22; 1 Pet. i. 22; 1 Cor. i. 18; Acts xx. 35; Matt. vi. 6.
1837. 2 Cor. ii. 16; Is. xxi. 11; 1 John iii. 3; James iii. 17; 1 Sam. iv. 22.
1838. Jude 3; 1 Tim. i. 11; 1 Tim.

- vi. 6; Heb. x. 25; Mark xvi. 15; Rom. i. 16; Phil. ii. 5; 2 Cor. iv. 5; Matt. xxviii. 19.
1839. Ps. cxvii. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 4; Gal. i. 10, last clause; Rev. ii. 23; Luke xiv. 23; Acts xx. 24; Ps. cxix. 117; Rom. ix. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 17, 18; John xv. 5.
1840. 2 Tim. ii. 7; Dan. iv. 35; Mark xvi. 16; Matt. iii. 9; Ps. li. 4; 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8; 2 Cor. viii. 7; Matt. x. 16; 2 Pet. i. 12; 1 Cor. iii. 7; Jer. xlv. 25.
1841. 2 Sam. xii. 13; Matt. xix. 26; Josh. iii. 5; John i. 13; Matt. vii. 18; 2 Tim. iii. 12; Phil. ii. 20; 2 Cor. iv. 2; Gen. iii. 4.
1842. 1 Tim. iv. 16; 2 Tim. i. 13; Col. i. 28; Mark vi. 34; James i. 15; Is. lxii. 1; Mark vii. 37; 1 Cor. i. 23, 24; Luke xvi. 27, 28; Eph. i. 22; Rom. xii. 18; Ps. xxiv. 1; John xvi. 7, 8.
1843. Luke xvii. 20; 1 Cor. ii. 2; Rom. xiv. 23; Lev. x. 3; Lev. xix. 32; Acts xvii. 11; Matt. vi. 23; Zech. vii. 9; Luke xii. 48; Zech. vii. 9; Acts xiii. 44; John iii. 16; Solomon's Song i. 6, last half; 1 John i. 9.
1844. 1 Cor. iv. 1; Is. l. 11; 2 Pet. i. 5, 6, 7; 2 Cor. v. 18; Ps. cxix. 24; Ezek. xxxiii. 11; Is. lxii. 6, 7; Gal. vi. 10; John i. 31; Dan. ii. 35; Heb. xi. 13; Ps. cxix. 96.
1845. 1 Cor. iv. 1; 2 Pet. i. 16; Acts xxvi. 28; 1 Pet. iv. 7; 1 Kings xi. 2; Ps. xix. 7; John iii. 3; John xvii. 20, 21; Acts iv. 33; Ps. x. 1; 1 Thess. iv. 3, 23; Acts xiii. 2; Matt. xi. 28.
1846. 2 Sam. xviii. 16; Is. iii. 10, 11; Col. iii. 3; Lev. xix. 17, and Eph. v. 7; Prov. xxv. 2; Luke ix. 62; 1 Thess. iii. 12; John xvii. 21; Rom. v. 6; James iii. 2; Ps. v. 4, 5; 2 Kings viii. 11; Phil. iii. 3; John xvii. 17.
1847. Ps. cxvii. 6; Rev. xiv. 13; Rom. xii. 19; Matt. xiii. 10, 11; Eph. v. 2; Acts ii. 1; Rom. i. 16; Mark xvi. 15; Matt. xvi. 18; Jer. xxxii. 18, 19; Is. i. 18; Ps. cxix. 113; 2 Cor. vi. 3; Heb. i. 3; James ii. 18-20.
1848. Ps. xc. 12; Matt. v. 20; Gen. i. 26, 27; 1 John iii. 3; Matt. xiii. 31, 32; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; 1 Tim. iii. 1; James i. 17; Mark x. 14; Ps. lxxi. 7; Rom. v. 1.
1849. Matt. xx. 23; Ps. liii. 2, 3; John xv. 25; Philip. i. 9; Mark x. 42-44; Ezek. xxxiii. 32; 1 Chron. xxix. 5; Job xlii. 5, 6; Eccles. vii. 10; 1 Tim. i. 15; Ps. lxxxvi. 5; Dan. iv. 35; 2 Cor. v. 20; John xix. 30; Rev. iii. 21, 22.
1850. Ps. xxxix. 12; 2 Cor. v. 11; Rom. viii. 20; 1 Cor. ii. 2; Rom. ii. 11, 12, 16; Is. xxvi. 12; Acts xxv. 11; Luke xxiv. 46, 47; 1 Cor. ii. 9; Luke xv. 7; Rom. viii. 24; Luke xxiv. 52, 53; Heb. ix. 26; 1 Cor. xi. 19; John iii. 3; Luke xviii. 11, 12.
1851. 2 Cor. iv. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 13; Eph. i. 13, 14; Neh. vi. 3; Ps. lxxvi. 10; Psalm cxix. 59; Col. i. 28.
1852. Rev. iii. 16; John xvii. 21; John xvi. 8, 9; (2 Cor. v. 18, and Rev. iv. 2, and John xii. 28, also 1 Cor. vi. 20.)
1853. Ezek. xx. 49; 1 Cor. x. 31; Rom. i. 16.
1854. 1 Cor. xiv. 20, last clause.
1855. Rom. viii. 6; Rev. xxii. 17.
1856. Col. iii. 11; John xvii. 21; Ps. cxvii. 5, 6.
1857. 1 Cor. iii. 11; (Gal. iv. 19, and Col. i. 27;) John i. 41; Eccl. i. 4.

## CONGREGATIONAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES IN 1869-70.

THE following lists are compiled from the printed catalogues and information in manuscript. All honorary titles being dropped from the names of ministers, it is safe to address each Professor as D. D. A dash in the column "Graduated" signifies that the person mentioned is not a graduate of any college; a blank in the same situation signifies our ignorance.

The following list of abbreviations of names of colleges, which we have used in part for several years, was prepared after careful survey of the whole field. To avoid obscurity, we were obliged to make several changes from the abbreviations used in the several catalogues. Our rule is, in case of conflict, to use the simple initials for the older colleges, and more extended abbreviations for the later ones. Thus, "B. C." belongs to Bowdoin College, and not to Beloit, although the Chicago catalogue gives it to the latter. It would be very convenient to us, and to the general public, if our seminaries would adopt our list, and it would do them no harm. The Andover Triennial uses it.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Ad.C. Adrian College, Michigan.        | R.U. Rochester University, New York.    |
| Al.C. Alleghany College, Pennsylvania. | Ri.C. Ripon College, Wisconsin.         |
| A.C. Amherst College, Massachusetts.   | R.C. Rutgers College, New Jersey.       |
| B.C. Bowdoin College, Maine.           | T.C. Tusculum College, Tennessee.       |
| Ba.C. Bates College, Maine.            | U.C. Union College, New York.           |
| Bel.C. Beloit College, Wisconsin.      | U.Ch. University of Chicago.            |
| B.U. Brown University, Rhode Island.   | U.E. University of Edinburgh, Scotland. |
| Cal.C. College of California.          | U.M. University of Michigan, Michigan.  |
| C.U. Colby University, Maine.          | U.P. University of Pennsylvania, Pa.    |
| D.C. Dartmouth College, New Hampshire. | U.Vt. University of Vermont, Vermont.   |
| F.G.C. Forest Grove College, Oregon.   | Wab.C. Wabash College, Indiana.         |
| Gen.C. Genesee College.                | Washb.C. Washburn College, Kansas.      |
| Ham.C. Hamilton College, New York.     | Wat.C. Waterville College, Maine.       |
| H.C. Harvard College, Massachusetts.   | Wg.C. Waynesburg College.               |
| Hills.C. Hillsdale College, Michigan.  | Wh.C. Wheaton College, Illinois.        |
| Ho.C. Howard College (?).              | W.R.C. Western Reserve College, Ohio.   |
| Ill.C. Illinois College, Illinois.     | W.C. Williams College, Massachusetts.   |
| Io.C. Iowa College, Iowa.              | Y.C. Yale College, Connecticut.         |
| Ken.C. Kenyon College, Ohio.           |   |
| K.C. Knox College, Illinois.           |   |
| Ki.C. King's College, Nova Scotia.     |   |
| LU. London University.                 |   |
| Mad.U. Madison University, New York.   |   |
| Mar.C. Marietta College, Ohio.         |   |
| McG.U. McGill University, Canada.      |   |
| M.C. Middlebury College, Vermont.      |   |
| Mon.C. Monmouth College.               |   |
| N.J.C. New Jersey College, New Jersey. |   |
| N.Y.C. New York College, New York.     |   |
| N.Y.U. New York University, New York.  |   |
| O.C. Oberlin College, Ohio.            |   |
| Ol.C. Olivet College, Mich.            |   |
| O.W.U. Ohio Wesleyan University, Ohio. |   |
| Pa.C. Pennsylvania College.            |   |

### I. — THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, BAN- GOR, ME.

#### FACULTY.

- Rev. ENOCH POND, President, Waldo Professor of Ecclesiastical History.
- Rev. DANIEL SMITH TALCOTT, Hayes Professor of Sacred Literature.
- Rev. JOHN R. HERRICK, Buck Professor of Christian Theology, and Librarian.
- Rev. WILLIAM M. BARBOUR, Fogg Professor of Sacred Rhetoric and Pastoral Duties.
- THOMAS H. RICH, Assistant Teacher of Hebrew.

## SENIOR CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
John Bragdon, Wells.	
Samuel D. Church, Bangor.	
William Forsyth, Bangor.	
Vitellus Merrill Hardy, Chicago, Ill.	A.C. 1865
Clement G. Harwood, New York.	
William C. Hulse, Johnston, Wis.	Hills.C. 1868
Andrew J. McLeod, Milton, N. S.	McG.U.
Webster K. Pierce, Winterport.	
John T. Rea, Boston, Mass.	
William A. Spaulding, Hanover, N. H.	D.C.
E. S. Tingley, Milford, Mass.	

(11)

## MIDDLE CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
William H. Bolster, Paris.	Ba.C. 1869
R. Henry Davis, Milford, Del.	A.C. 1868
George A. P. Gilman, Laconia, N. H.	
Daniel Warren Hardy, Chicago, Ill.	B.C.
Calvin G. Hill, Attleborough, Mass.	A.C. 1867
Leonard Hutchins, New Portland.	
Albert N. Jones, Weld.	
G. W. Jones, Weld.	
Alvin B. Jordan, Raymond.	B.C.
Jotham Sewall, Fryeburg.	W.C. 1868
M. C. True, Strong.	
Joseph E. Walker, Forest Grove, Or.	F.G.C. 1867

(12)

## JUNIOR CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
De Alva S. Alexander, Defiance, Ohio.	B.C.
John Justin Blair, Portland.	
Almon Taylor Clarke, Wadham's Mills, N. Y.	
LeRoy Z. Collins, Union.	B.C.
William N. T. Dean, Fall River, Mass.	
Samuel W. Dickinson, Griggsville, Ill.	
Roselle A. Fuller, Philadelphia, N. Y.	A.C. 1869
Daniel C. Heath, Farmington.	A.C. 1868
Daniel L. Smart, Brooklyn, N. Y.	
Arthur H. Tebbets, Portsmouth, N. H.	

(10)

Total, 33.

## II. — ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, ANDOVER, MASS.

## FACULTY.

Rev. EDWARDS A. PARK, Abbot Professor of Christian Theology.
Rev. JOHN L. TAYLOR, Smith Professor of Theology and Homiletics (in the Special Course) and Lecturer on Pastoral Theology.
Rev. AUSTIN PHELPS, Bartlet Professor of Sacred Rhetoric.
Rev. EGBERT C. SMYTH, Brown Professor of Ecclesiastical History.
Rev. J. HENRY THAYER, Associate Professor of Sacred Literature.

Rev. CHARLES M. MEAD, Hitchcock Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature.

Rev. JOHN W. CHURCHILL, Jones Professor of Elocution.

## LIBRARIAN.

Rev. WILLIAM L. ROPES.

## LECTURERS.

Prof. SAMUEL HARRIS, on Foreign Missions.

Rev. INCREASE N. TARBOX, on Congregationalism. ———, on Revivals.

Rev. JACOB M. MANNING, on the Relations of Christianity to Popular Infidelity.

Rev. DANIEL P. NOYES, on Home Evangelization.

Prof. NOAH PORTER, on Intellectual Philosophy.

## RESIDENT LICENTIATES.

Name and Residence.	Coll. Grad. Sem.
John F. Aiken, Andover, Mass.	D.C. 1858.
S. R. Asbury, Andover, Mass.	L.U. 1852.
Joseph Cook, Ticonderoga, N. Y.	H.C. 1865.
J. G. Dougherty, Newport, R. I.	B.U. 1865.
Horace Dutton, Andover, Mass.	Y.C. 1862.

(5)

## SENIOR CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
Amory H. Bradford, Charlotte, Mich.	Ham.C. 1867
Horace Bumstead, Boston, Mass.	Y.C. 1863
Michael Burnham, Essex, Mass.	A.C. 1867
Charles Edwin Cooledge, Chicopee Falls, Mass.	
Sidney Crawford, Andover, Mass.	A.C. ———
Theodore L. Day, Newton, Mass.	A.C. 1861
Henry Morton Dexter, Boston, Mass.	Y.C. 1867
Albert Elijah Dunning, Andover, Mass.	Y.C. 1867
John Lewis Ewell, Byfield, Mass.	Y.C. 1865
Jeremiah E. Fullerton, Bath, Me.	B.C. 1865
James Taylor Graves, Conway, Mass.	Y.C. 1866
Frederick A. Hand, Hancock, Mass.	W.C. 1867
Edward Young Hincks, Bridgeport, Ct.	Y.C. 1866
Francis T. Ingalls, Haverhill, Mass.	W.C. 1864
John Henry Jones, Youngstown, O.	W.R.C. 1867
Lucian Dwight Mears, Beloit, Wis.	Bel.C. 1862
Charles Henry Merrill, Haverhill, N. H.	D.C. 1867
James Fiske Merriam, Springfield, Mass.	Y.C. 1867
Charles L. Mitchell, Brooklyn, N. Y.	Y.C. 1866
Nathan Round Nichols, Danby, Vt.	M.C. 1866
George Lyman Nims, Sullivan, N. H.	M.C. 1865
George Herbert Palmer, Boston, Mass.	H.C. 1864
Charles Ware Park, West Boxford, Mass.	A.C. 1867
John Warren Partridge, Worcester, Mass.	

Y.C. 1867

# 1870.] *Congregational Theological Seminaries in 1869-70.* 293

Henry Dwight Porter, Chicago, Ill.	Bel.C. 1867	Albert Weston Moore, Malden, Mass.	D.C. 1864
Andrew Jackson Rogers, Charlestown, Mass.		Frederic Palmer, Boston, Mass.	H.C. 1869
	B.U. 1867	Stuart Phelps, Andover, Mass.	Y.C. 1869
Charles M. Southgate, Woodstock, Vt.	Y.C. 1836	Elihu Root, Belchertown, Mass.	A.C. 1867
Charles E. Sumner, Spencer, Mass.	Y.C. 1863	S. G. Updyke, Reading, Mich.	
Charles R. Treat, Boston, Mass.	W.C. 1863		Sci. Dept., Hills.C. 1869
Thomas R. Willard, Galesburg, Ill.	K.C. 1866	Wm. Haskell Woodwell, Newburyport, Mass.	
(30)		(21)	B.C. 1869

## MIDDLE CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
Henry Tucker Arnold, Providence, R. I.	B.U. —
Charles Dana Barrows, Fryeburg, Me.	D.C. 1864
Charles Terry Collins, Hartford, Conn.	Y.C. 1867
Ephraim M. Corey, Hillsdale, Mich.	Hills.C. 1868
Oliver P. Emerson, Hawaiian Islands.	W.C. 1868
Fred. Wyett Fairfield, Oak Park, Ill.	O.C. 1868
Austin Samuel Garver, Chambersburg, Penn.	
	Pa.C. —
M. Lafayette Gordon, Waynesburg, Pa.	Wg.C. 1868
G. A. Jackson, North Adams, Mass.	
	Sci. Dept. Y.C. 1868
Geo. Whitefield Kinne, Norwich, Conn.	W.C. 1868
Burke Fay Leavitt, Lowell, Mass.	W.C. 1868
Stephen M. Newman, West Falmouth, Me.	
	B.C. 1867
Levi Rodgers, Andover, Mass.	D.C. 1866
Charles Henry Rowley, Middlebury, Vt.	M.C. 1868
Fred. A. Schaeffler, Constantinople, Turkey.	
	W.C. 1867
Jesse Porter Sprowls, East Finley, Penn.	
	Wg.C. 1868
James Brainard Taylor, Boston, Mass.	H.C. 1867
Louis Bevier Voorhees, Rocky Hill, N.J.	N.J.C. 1868
Jonathan Wadhams, Clarkson, N. Y.	W.C. 1867
Joel Fisk Whitney, Wadham's Mills, N. Y.	
	M.C. 1868
Henry C. Woodruff, Brooklyn, N. Y.	Y.C. 1863
(21)	

## JUNIOR CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
Hiram Payson Barnes, Martinsburg, O.	
	Ken.C. 1868
Thomas Rissel Beeber, Muncy, Penn.	Pa.C. 1869
Charles H. Brooks, Lennoxville, Que.	McG.U. 1868
John Kittredge Browne, Saxtonville, Mass.	
	H.C. 1869
John S. Copp, Flushing, Mich.	Hills.C. 1869
Samuel Howard Dana, Portland, Me.	Y.C. 1869
Charles Fletcher Dole, Norridgewock, Me.	
	H.C. 1868
Archibald Duff, Sherbrooke, Que.	McG.U. 1864
Wm. Wells Euton, Andover, Mass.	A.C. 1868
James H. Ecob, Franklin, N.Y.	Ham.C. 1869
Lewis Emerson, Westford, Mass.	
Omar White Folsom, Hanover, N. H.	D.C. 1869
Perley M. Griffin, Topeka, Kan.	Washb.C. 1869
Edward C. Hood, Chester, Penn.	N.J.C. 1868
Thomas M. May, Bristol, R. I.	—

## SPECIAL COURSE.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
Benjamin S. Adams, Golden City, Col.	—
Thomas Scott Burnell, Melur, India.	—
John Walter Lees, Andover, Mass.	—
Wm. Redfield Stocking, Oroomiah, Persia.	
	W.C. —
Henry Laurens Talbot, East Machias, Me.	—
Ludwig Wolfen, Achtrup, Denmark.	—
(6)	Total, 78.

## III.—THEOLOGICAL DEPARTMENT, YALE COLLEGE, CONN.

### FACULTY.

Rev. THEODORE D. WOOLSEY, President.
Rev. ELEAZER T. FITCH, Emeritus.
Rev. LEONARD BACON, Acting Professor of Revealed Theology.
Rev. NOAH PORTER, Clark Professor of Moral Philosophy and Metaphysics, and Instructor in Natural Theology.
Rev. GEORGE E. DAY, Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature, and Biblical Theology.
Rev. JAMES M. HOPPIN, Professor of Homiletics and the Pastoral Charge.
Rev. GEORGE P. FISHER, Professor of Ecclesiastical History.
Rev. TIMOTHY DWIGHT, Professor of Sacred Literature.

### RESIDENT LICENTIATES.

Name and Residence.	Coll. Grad.
Cornelius Ladd Kitchell, D. B., Middlebury, Vt.	
	Y.C. 1862
David Brainerd Perry, D. B., Worcester, Mass.	
	Y.C. 1863
(2)	

### SENIOR CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated
Thomas Dougal Barclay, Van Vechten, N. Y.	
	Mon.C.
Anselm Byron Brown, New Haven, Conn.	
	Y.C. 1867
Daniel Augustus Evans, Nantyglo, Wales.	
	—
Albert Francis Hale, Springfield, Ill.	Y.C. 1866

## 294 *Congregational Theological Seminaries in 1869-70.* [April,

Joseph William Hartshorn, New Haven, Conn.	Y.C. 1867
James Phillips Hoyt, Guilford, Conn.	Y.C. 1864
Elijah James, Oakland, Cal.	Cal.C.
Robert George Stephen McNeille, Philadelphia, Penn.	Y.C. 1863
Edward Comfort Starr, Guilford, Conn.	Y.C. 1866
Juba Howe Vorce, Crown Point, N. Y.	M.C.
Charles Swan Walker, Cincinnati, Ohio.	Y.C. 1867

(11)

### MIDDLE CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
Theodore Lansing Day, Newton, Mass.	Y.C. 1867
John Kinne Hyde DeForest, Lyme, Conn.	Y.C. 1868
Charles Wesley Drake, Elkhart, Ill.	Gen.C.
Charles Winthrop Fifield, Concord, N. H.	Y.C. 1864
Lauren Matthew Foster, Meriden, Conn.	—
Edward Pierpont Horrick, New Haven, Conn.	—
Alexander Johnston, Pittsburg, Penn.	Y.C. 1867
David Evan Jones, Olyphant, Penn.	—
James Brainerd Tyler, New Haven, Conn.	Y.C. 1864

(9)

### JUNIOR CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
Arthur Herman Adams, Cleveland, O.	Y.C. 1867
George C. Booth, Quincy, Ill.	—
Robert Allen Hume, New Haven, Conn.	Y.C. 1868
William Gosser Marts, Washington, D. C.	—
Elisha Wright Miller, Williston, Vt.	Y.C. 1868
Pascal Decatur Murray, New Britain, Conn.	—
Austin Hull Norris, Centre Brook, Conn.	—
Edward Kirk Rawson, Albany, N. Y.	Y.C. 1868
Richard Austin Rice, New Haven, Conn.	Y.C. 1868
Rufus Byam Richardson, Groton, Mass.	Y.C. 1869
Arthur Shirley, New York City.	Y.C. 1869
Thomas Clayton Welles, Wethersfield, Conn.	Y.C. 1868
George Oliver Whitney, Bridgeport, Conn.	—

Mad. U.

(13)

Total, 33

## IV. — THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF CONNECTICUT, HARTFORD, CONN.

### FACULTY.

Rev. WILLIAM THOMPSON, Nettleton Professor of Biblical Literature.
Rev. ROBERT G. VERMILYE, Riley Professor of Christian Theology.
Rev. JOSEPH C. BODWELL, Hosmer Professor of Preaching and the Pastoral Charge.

Rev. PHILIP SCHAFF, Waldo Professor of Ecclesiastical History.

### LECTURERS.

ARNOLD GUTOT, LL.D. The Connection of Revealed Religion and Ethnological Science.
Rev. RUFUS ANDERSON, History and Nature of Missions.
Rev. ALONZO H. QUINT, Congregationalism.

### RESIDENT LICENTIATES.

None reported.

### SENIOR CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
Abel S. Clark, New Haven, Conn.	Not reported.
Aaron W. Field, Barnardston, Mass.	"
Adelbert F. Keith, N. Bridgewater, Mass.	"
F. B. Phelps, North Amherst, Mass.	"
Charles E. Simmons, Worcester, Mass.	"
Henry W. Teller, Mt. Cisco, N. Y.	"

(6)

### MIDDLE CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
Joseph C. Bodwell, Jr., Hartford, Conn.	Not reported.
Frank H. Buffum, Winchester, N. H.	"
Myron Eells, Walla-Walla, Wash. Ter.	"
Vincent Moses, Clymer, N. Y.	"
Isaac F. Tobey, Boston, Mass.	"

(5)

### JUNIOR CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
John M. Chapin, Springfield, Mass.	Not reported.
D. B. Dodge, North Abington, Mass.	"
G. S. Dodge, North Brookfield, Mass.	"
George Dodson, Hartford, Conn.	"
E. S. Gould, Hartford, Conn.	"
D. B. Hubbard, Higganum, Conn.	"
C. W. Kilbon, New London, Conn.	"
T. C. Kinrie, Norwich, Conn.	"
F. B. Makepeace, Worcester, Conn.	"
Henry M. Perkins, Chicopee, Mass.	"

(10)

Total, 21.

## V. — THEOLOGICAL DEPARTMENT, OBERLIN COLLEGE, OHIO.

### FACULTY.

Rev. JAMES H. FAIRCHILD, President, Avery Professor of Moral Philosophy, and Professor of Systematic Theology.
Rev. CHARLES G. FINNEY, Professor of Pastoral Theology.
Rev. JOHN MORGAN, Professor of Biblical Literature.
Rev. STEPHEN C. LEONARD, Instructor in Sacred Rhetoric and Ecclesiastical History.



## SENIOR CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
John A. Bedient, Little Valley, N. Y.	O.C. 1866
Roselle T. Cross, Richville, N. Y.	O.C. 1867
James E. Todd, Tabor, Io.	O.C. 186
Richard Winsor, Boston, Mass.	O.C. 1867
Albert A. Wright, Oberlin, O.	O.C. 1865
Cassius E. Wright, Saybrook, O.	O.C. 1867

(6)

## MIDDLE CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
Levi F. Bickford, Wheaton, Ill.	O.C. 1868
Cornelius B. Bradley, Bangkok, Siam.	O.C. 1868
Justus N. Brown, Oberlin, O.	O.C. 1867
Almon W. Burr, Oberlin, O.	O.C. 1868
Charles C. Darwin, Burlington, Io.	O.C. 1868
Frederick W. Fairfield, Oak Park, Ill.	O.C. 1868
John G. Fraser, Oberlin, O.	O.C. 1867
Herman A. French, Granville, Ill.	O.C. 1868
Robert W. Logan, Mallett Creek, O.	—
Daniel K. Pangborn, Oberlin, O.	—
Charles A. Richardson, East Cleveland, O.	—
	O.C. 1868
James R. Severance, Bellevue, O.	O.C. 1868
Hinds Smith, Oberlin, O.	O.C. 1868
William Woodmense, Denmark, Io.	O.C. 1868

(14)

## JUNIOR CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
Henry R. Chittenden, Flint, Mich.	(?) O.C. 1869
Charles N. Fitch, Geneva, O.	O.C. 1869
Page F. McClelland, Russia, O.	O.C. 1869
Edwin C. Stickel, Decatur, Ill.	(?) O.C. 1869
Joseph P. Preston, Huntington, O.	—

(5)

Total, 25.

## VI. — CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CHICAGO, ILL.

## FACULTY.

- Rev. JOSEPH HAVEN, Illinois Professor of Systematic Theology.
- Rev. SAMUEL C. BARTLETT, New England Professor of Biblical Literature.
- Rev. FRANKLIN W. FISK, Wisconsin Professor of Sacred Rhetoric.
- , Professor of Ecclesiastical History.
- (Instruction given in this department for the present by Prof. Haven. Lectures on Pastoral Duties by Prof. Bartlett.)

## INSTRUCTOR IN ELOCUTION.

Prof. EDWARD M. BOOTH, A.M.

## SENIOR CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
Edward N. Barrett, Chicago, Ill.	K.C. 1866
George S. Bascom, Princeton, Ill.	Bel.C. 1866
Oliver P. Champlin, Stafford Springs, Conn.	—
William H. Cross, Roscoe, Ill.	Bel.C. 1865
Edward P. Goodrich, Allegan, Mich.	U.M. 1865
Charles C. Harrah, Newton, Io.	—
Stanley E. Lathrop, Glenwood, Minn.	Bel.C. 1867
Oscar C. McCulloch, Chicago, Ill.	—
Alexander R. Thain, Milburn, Ill.	—
Thomas J. Valentine, Providence, R. I.	B.U. 1867

(10)

## MIDDLE CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
Amos J. Bailey, Wheaton, Ill.	Wh.C. 1868
Frederick W. Bush, West Leroy, Mich.	O.C. 1868
Cephas F. Clapp, Lamolille, Ill.	—
John A. Cruzan, McGregor, Io.	—
Julian H. Dixon, Lena, Ill.	Bel.C. 1867
Frederic W. Fairfield, Oak Park, Ill.	O.C. 1868
George D. Marsh, Grinnell, Io.	Ia.C. 1867
Albert Matson, Wheaton, Ill.	—
M. Lester S. Noyes, Chicago, Ill.	—
Myron W. Pinkerton, Waupun, Wis.	Rip.C. 1868
Emanuel Van Noorden, The Hague, Holland.	—

(11)

## JUNIOR CLASS.

Name and Residence.	Graduated.
Seth A. Arnold, Grinnell, Io.	Ia.C. 1869
John W. Baird, Waukesha, Wis.	Bel.C. 1869
Salathiel D. Belt, Bloomington, Ill.	O.C. 1864
Otis D. Crawford, Dubuque, Io.	—
James D. Eaton, Lancaster, Wis.	Bel.C. 1869
William J. Evans, Genesee, Wis.	Bel.C. 1869
R. Cushman Flagg, Castleton, Vt.	M.C. 1869
Robert M. Hall, Plymouth, Ill.	K.C. 1869
Peter Hendrickson, North Cape, Wis.	Bel.C. 1867
Alva A. Hurd, Clinton, Conn.	—
Thomas L. Riggs, Beloit, Wis.	Bel.C. 1868
Albert W. Safford, Rockford, Ill.	—
Darius B. Scott, Mainville, Ill.	Wh.C.
Henry C. Simmons, Beloit, Wis.	Bel.C. 1869
John G. Taylor, Black Earth, Wis.	U.W. 1868
A. Edwards Tracy, Bloomington, Wis.	A.C. 1869
Newell S. Wright, Alden, Ill.	Bel.C. 1869

(17)

## SPECIAL COURSE.

## SECOND YEAR.

Name and Residence.
Charles M. Bingham, Udina, Ill.
George S. Codington, Terre Haute, Ind.
Henry Jacobs, Ontario, Ill.
Oscar G. May, Chicago, Ill.

(4)

## FIRST YEAR.

Name and Residence.
Horatio M. Case, Lewis, Io.
Edward R. Chase, Flint, Mich.
William C. Hicks, Tomah, Wis.

(3)

Total, 45

## SUMMARY.

	Faculty.	Lecturers, &c.	Resident Licentiates.	Students.					Volumes in Library.	Anniversaries in 1870.
				Senior.	Middle.	Junior.	Special Course.	TOTAL.		
Bangor	5	-	-	11	12	10	0	33	12,000	Thursday, July 28.
Andover	7	5	5	30	21	21	6	78	30,000	Thursday, July 7.
Yale	7	-	12	11	9	13	0	33	College (\$3,000).	Thursday, May 19.
Hartford	4	3	-	6	5	10	0	21	Not reported.	Not reported, June —
Oberlin	4	-	-	6	14	5	0	25	College (10,000).	July 27, August 4.
Chicago	3	1	-	10	11	17	7	45	4,500	Thursday, April 28.
San Francisco	1	-	0	-	-	5	0	5		Not reported.
TOTAL, 7	31	9	7	74	72	81	13	240		

## TERMS AND VACATIONS.

**BANGOR.** — The Anniversary is on the Thursday following the last Wednesday in July. There is but one vacation in the year, commencing at the Anniversary, and continuing twelve weeks.

**ANDOVER.** — Anniversary, Thursday, July 7, 1870. Vacation of ten weeks follows Anniversary. The present year is divided into two terms, — the first ending March 24, 1870, followed by a vacation of two weeks; the second term begins Thursday, April 7, 1870, and continues until Anniversary. The next Seminary year commences on Thursday, September 15, 1870.

**YALE.** — There is but one term. The session for 1869-70 commenced on Thursday, September 16, 1869, and continues until Anniversary, Thursday, May 19, 1870. Four months' vacation follows the Anniversary. The term of 1870-71 begins on Wednesday, September 14, 1870.

**HARTFORD.** — *No report.* Probably one term only, which commences about the first of October, and continues to about the middle of June.

**OBERLIN.** — Same as College Department. Fall term began August 31, 1869, and ended November 20, 1869. Spring term, February 15, 1870, to May 7, 1870. Summer term, May 11, 1870, to August 4, 1870. Anniversary of the Theological Society, July 27, 1870. Sermon to the Theological Alumni, August 2, 1870. Commencement, August 4, 1870. Next year begins on Tuesday, August 30, 1870.

**CHICAGO.** — Two terms, — the "Lecture term" and the "Reading term"; the Lecture term commencing on the second Wednesday of September, and continuing till the last Thursday in April; the Reading term extending from the first Wednesday in June to the beginning of the Lecture term. Anniversary, last Thursday in April. "The Reading term is intended to be passed by the student under the supervision of some pastor, under whose care he may pursue the course of study prescribed by the Faculty, while at the same time acquainting himself with the details and practical duties of pastoral life."

The "Alumni Institute" opens on the Tuesday evening nearest the 20th of October, and continues eight days.

**CALIFORNIA.** — The Seminary opened June, 1869. We have no report of terms and vacations.

## CONGREGATIONAL NECROLOGY.

ELISHA SNELL FISH died in Gilsum, N. H., July 4, 1869, in his eightieth year. He was the oldest son of Rev. Elisha Fish, who was first minister of Gilsum, and grandson of Rev. Elisha Fish, first minister of Upton, Mass. His mother was the daughter of Deacon Ebenezer Snell, of North Bridgewater, afterward of Cummington, Mass., and the sister of Rev. Thomas Snell, D. D., of North Brookfield, Mass., and also of Mrs. Bryant, the mother of William C. Bryant. He was born in Windsor, Mass., September 5, 1789, where his father was then pastor of the Congregational Church. When he was six years of age they removed to Gilsum. As the first settled minister, his father here received a lot of land, upon which he built a house and barn, and cleared up a few acres. When the subject of this sketch was seventeen years of age, his father died. This changed the whole course of his life. It had been intended that he should obtain a collegiate education. Being the oldest of six children, he became the adviser and support of his widowed mother, and for her sake gave up his cherished hopes of a professional career. His life was spent in agricultural pursuits, and he became well known in the county of his residence for his success in horticulture.

At the age of twenty-seven he married Mary Wilcox, January 29, 1817, with whom he lived forty-four years. She died September 13, 1861, and of her as a wife and mother it might well have been said, "She hath done what she could."

He was naturally a scholar, and would have been a man of mark in either of the learned professions. Taught to read by his mother, he had read through the Bible before completing his sixth year. At the age of seven his grandfather gave him "Dwight's Geography," which he read through and through, till he became perfectly familiar with its contents. His father's library was small, but select. He had access also to a small town library. Many of the books he read and reread. He had remarkable skill and facility in composition for one of his limited opportunities. He frequently wrote for the public prints, especially in poetry, for which he had much taste. He was a subscriber to the Boston Recorder every year from the first of its existence, and here many of his verses were published. He was accustomed to have the Recorder read aloud in the family; and carefully preserved all its numbers from the first. Like every true man, he had decided convictions of what was right in belief and practice for himself, and was perhaps a little too intolerant of what in others seemed to him laxity in life or doctrine. Hence those who knew him *little* were inclined to think him austere and conceited. But to his intimate acquaintance he was known to be very genial and large-hearted, quick in sympathy, and humble in his estimate of himself. Familiar with the writings of Hopkins, Edwards, and Emmons, he thoroughly understood their peculiar and individual modes of thought. Butler's Analogy was one of his favorite books, but the Bible was his constant companion. From the age of six to the day of his death he practised reading it in course. Few clergymen had so extensive and minutely accurate acquaintance with its teachings. Every word was sacred to him as though uttered by the very lips of Jehovah. Hence he could tolerate almost anything

else sooner than the slightest doubt of the least of its sayings. Hence, also, he naturally accepted, and held with the utmost tenacity, all the "strong" "doctrines of grace." Paul was his model theologian. He believed in progress, and was ever ready to welcome from any source *real* light, that should lead to social, moral, or religious advance. But he had no sympathy with fanaticism, and had an intense abhorrence of all "Reforms against Nature." He was a decided friend of the Temperance cause, and practised Total Abstinence many years before public attention was aroused to this subject. He was a firm and earnest friend of liberty for all, and more than fifty years ago wrote with much feeling concerning the wrongs of the slave. And none rejoiced more than he to be permitted to live to see the chains of the bondmen broken.

He was remarkable for simple-hearted, sincere truthfulness, and honesty in all his intercourse and dealings with others. The slightest prevarication was to him a serious offence. Even his enemies never doubted his moral integrity. Perhaps no one ever more literally obeyed the command, "Thou shalt keep my Sabbaths, and reverence my sanctuary." The Sabbath was to him "a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable." He never gave up the habit of beginning its observance with the setting sun of Saturday. In his household could ever be seen the solemnity and decorum of a genuine *Puritan* Sabbath. Nothing secular was to be read or talked of. Any letters received on that day must remain unopened till sunset. It was *God's* day, and must not be used for other than religious and strictly necessary purposes.

Few men were so ready to deny themselves, and give, even beyond their means, for the support of the gospel. Even when a young man, the *Church* seemed to be dearer to him than all else. The church in Gilsun was small and poor. When the laws were so changed that a voluntary society must be formed in order to sustain preaching, no one moved until he went around and solicited subscribers to procure a charter. A deacon remarked that if a young man like him was making such efforts for the cause of religion, it was certainly time for the *church* to awake to *their* duty. Soon after this certain uneducated preachers, calling themselves *Christ-ians*, came to the place, and attracted great attention, so that many withdrew from the society, and some from the church. Gilsun was in fact "*burnt over*" with the excitement. In these circumstances the Congregational Church became "a byword and reproach." They had no preaching except when a minister happened among them. One Sabbath morning the proposal was made in his family to repair to the house of a good deacon, and stately hold a "reading meeting" until they could obtain preaching. This was the turning-point in the life of that church. The effort succeeded. Shortly after a Sabbath school was organized; and in about one year, obtaining aid from the New Hampshire Missionary Society, they secured a stated ministry. Evidently it might well be said of him as of another, "He was a pillar of the church many years before he became a member." His piety was of a reflective, quiet type. He had perhaps a somewhat morbid self-distrust, doubting his own piety so much that he did not unite with the church till nearly seventy years of age. During the many weeks of his last sickness he manifested much Christian patience and resignation, and his end was one of peaceful rest.

Mrs. MARY (SWINDELLS) HOPLEY, wife of the Rev. Samuel Hopley, died in Norwich, Conn., Wednesday, July 14, 1869, in her forty-first year. She was the daughter of Thomas and Sophia (Smelt) Swindells, and was born in London, England, January 22, 1829. Consecrated to God in infant baptism, she in early life gave her heart to Christ, and united with the church worshipping in Whitfield's Tabernacle, Moorfields, London. There she became an active Sabbath-school teacher, which position she held till she came to this country, in 1853, coming three thousand miles across the ocean to be united to him who now mourns her loss. She was married at Saxton's River, Vt., June 9, 1853, and for sixteen years was a faithful, devoted companion, a true helpmeet to her husband in the ministry, whose faith she often strengthened and whose hands she often lifted up. Here, as in her native land, she devoted herself to the Master's cause in various ways, ever ready to promote by her influence and activity the welfare of others.

She became the mother of three children, twin boys, born in Bangor, Me., and a little daughter born in Wellfleet, Mass., in whose training she was greatly interested, and for whose spiritual welfare she labored and prayed. They will long remember her as a loving, tender mother. All who knew her loved her, and can bear cheerful testimony to her excellence and worth. For several years past she had been in somewhat delicate health, though able to attend meeting, and devote herself to various household duties.

In the month of January, 1869, she visited, with her husband, the almshouse, to see a poor German woman, who was drawing near her end, when the effluvia of the sick-room seemed to strike her inwardly, and produced a nausea, which brought on a severe fit of sickness lasting twelve weeks. She, however, apparently recovered, so that she was again able to attend church and visit friends. On June 26 her husband and son (one had died four years before) sailed from New York on a brief visit to friends in London, leaving her in supposed usual health. But in a few days after their departure the disease broke out in the form of a boil on the side of her face, which, after it was lanced, in some mysterious way produced hemorrhage of the bowels or liver, and in four days she died,—just two days after the arrival of her husband in London.

She sank away so rapidly and quietly, and was so weak, as not to be able to speak, or leave any word or message for the absent loved ones. Thus she went to her rest; without a groan or sigh she peacefully fell asleep,—

“Asleep in Jesus, blessed sleep,  
From which none ever wakes to weep;  
A calm and undisturbed repose,  
Unbroken by the last of foes.”

Kind, loving friends tenderly cared for her, and did all that respect and affection could suggest during her sickness, and laid her remains in the beautiful cemetery, to await the return of husband and son from across the ocean, or rather to await the archangel's trump which shall awaken the dead. Dark as is this providence, we have only to say: “It is all right,” “He hath done all things well,” “Even so, Father, for so it seemeth good in thy sight.”

Mrs. AMELIA (WILDER) DUNCAN, wife of the Rev. Abel Gates Duncan, died in Scotland, Mass., October 23, 1869, aged seventy-three years.

Mrs. Duncan was a native of Hingham, Mass., the daughter of Captain Edward and Mary (Hersey) Wilder, who were the parents of *twenty-one* children. She was the fifteenth child, born April 13, 1796.

In her youth she began early to manifest characteristic energy, industry, sagacity, and economy, which through life gave her the means of meeting personal wants and the promptings of benevolent feeling. She was a successful teacher in the common schools, until she became the housekeeper in Boston of a bachelor brother, who was engaged in a large mechanical business. Continuing with him many years, and during the time, having experienced renewing grace, under the ministry of the Rev. Howard Malcolm, her excellence in the management of a large household attracted the notice of the directors of the Penitent Female Refuge in Boston, who induced her, by much persuasion, to become an assistant in that useful institution, in 1838, in connection with Miss Maria Howland and Miss Daniels, now the wife of the Rev. James R. Cushing, of Cotuit Port, Barnstable, Mas. She was eminently useful in the institution for fifteen years, exerting a wholesome influence upon the erring young females, many of whom, having been won back to purity and virtue, regarded her and her worthy associate matrons with the warmest gratitude. Her health at length failing, in 1853 the patrons of the institution reluctantly consented to her resignation.

June 27, 1859, she was married to Mr. Duncan. She was a Baptist in sentiment, but with Robert Hall, C. H. Spurgeon, and other eminent Baptists, she did not consider immersion as exclusively essential to communion at the table of our common Lord and Saviour. She therefore deemed it a duty and a privilege to unite with the Congregational Church to which her husband ministered, and always felt a lively interest in everything that related to its welfare.

In her Christian character she was wont to compare herself to Martha of Bethany rather than to Mary, her sister, both beloved of the Lord. She was in many respects like her whom the wise king of Israel eulogized. She worked willingly with her hands. She looked well to the ways of her household, and ate not the bread of idleness. She stretched out her hand to the poor; yea, she reached forth her hand to the needy.

In her last severe and protracted sickness she was, for the most part, remarkable for her patience and resignation, and even cheerfulness. At first she expressed a strong desire to live, that she might be useful, and assist her husband in his ministerial work. But when she found that her disease would not yield to the skill of physicians, she threw herself upon the principles of that religion which she had so long professed, and said, "Let the Lord do as seemeth good in his sight." She ever manifested an unwavering faith in the atoning blood of her Saviour, and a quiet and cheerful submission to the great Disposer of life and death. With wonderful acuteness her mind realized her condition, and setting her house in order, she waited for her end, which was indeed peace.

E. G.

REV. SAMUEL SPARHAWK died suddenly of heart disease at Pittsfield, Vt., November 8, 1869, aged sixty-seven years, ten months, and seven days.

He was born in Rochester, Vt., January 1, 1802. His parents were Ebenezer and Azubah (Jefferson) Sparhawk. He was a child of prayer, and in early youth hopefully experienced a saving change. At his conversion his desire was strong to become a minister of Jesus Christ. With this in view he began a course of preparatory study at the Orange County Grammar School at Randolph. Here, however, he was permitted to remain but a single term. An older brother having died, the care of his aged parents devolved on him. He therefore was obliged temporarily to abandon his purpose of study; returned home and soon married. His conscientiousness and zeal placed him at once among the foremost as a worker in the church of his native town, where he was chosen deacon, and served in that capacity upwards of four years. Meantime his father died. His worldly affairs having become somewhat prosperous, his convictions of duty regarding the ministry returned. After a brief study of theology, under the direction of Rev. Calvin D. Noble, of Rochester, he was licensed to preach May 2, 1838, by the Royalton Association at Brookfield. He immediately began to preach at Pittsfield. Here the tokens of divine favor evidently accompanied his labors, and he was ordained and installed as pastor of the Congregational Church March 19, 1839, Rev. Calvin D. Noble, of Rochester, preaching the sermon.

September 30, 1841, he was dismissed, and commenced preaching as stated supply at West Randolph on the last Sabbath in February, 1842. With this church he continued until November 1, 1845, and his labors were greatly blessed. The church, in the struggles of feebleness and comparative infancy, was destitute of a house of worship, holding service alternately at a Union house and a tavern hall fitted up for the purpose. Mr. Sparhawk preached a sermon from Hag. i. 8: "*Go up to the mountain, and bring wood, and build the house,*" &c., and in fifteen months a commodious house of worship was built and dedicated free of debt. His health being impaired, he now engaged for one year, from November 1, 1845, in the agency of the Vermont Bible Society. December 1, 1846, he commenced labor again as acting pastor at West Randolph, and continued until July, 1851, supplying also a few Sabbaths in Warren and Roxbury. January 1, 1852, he became the acting pastor at Randolph Centre, where he remained three years, and then, January 1, 1855, returned again to his former charge at West Randolph, and remained six years, till January 1, 1861. At this time, that the church might find no obstacle in the way of securing a younger man, he thought best to retire from the service. In April following, however, he began to supply the church in Stockbridge, and continued three years. Here also he had the pleasure of seeing a new house of worship built and dedicated February 17, 1864. At the close of his third year at Stockbridge, yielding to earnest solicitation, he returned to Pittsfield, the church of his first charge, over which he was ordained twenty-five years before, and there, though with health and energy somewhat impaired, he labored until his death. Nor were his last labors without their fruits. In May, 1867, he was permitted to welcome twelve persons to church-fellowship, and others at subsequent communion seasons.

Mr. Sparhawk was not strictly a theologian, nor was he a strong thinker. He was constantly embarrassed, from a conscious lack of early and thorough training. He was self-distrustful, yet tenacious of his own views. His fields of labor were within a circuit of twenty miles of his native town, and with feeble churches, to



which he added much of strength and progress. His preaching was earnest and eminently practical. He possessed a rare tact in social meetings; and his ministry, embracing a period of more than thirty years, if judged by apparent fruits, was in all respects a successful one.

His wife was Laura Fitts, born in Leicester, Vt., to whom he was married November 16, 1824. He had eight children, five of whom were born previous to his licensure, and five of whom, with the widow, survive to mourn his loss.

A. W. W.

REV. SAMUEL GOODRICH COE died at New Haven, Conn., December 7, 1869, in the fifty-first year of his age. He was the third son of Rev. Noah and Elisabeth (Goodrich) Coe, and was born at New Hartford, Oneida County, N. Y., October 22, 1819. His father was long widely known in that vicinity as a wise and successful pastor, and his usefulness was renewed while he ministered in later life to the church in Greenwich, Conn. The mother of Mr. Coe was the daughter of Rev. Samuel Goodrich, first of Ridgefield, Conn., then of Berlin, whose family have been remarkable, in the first and second generations, for literary ability and devoted Christian service.

Mr. Coe was educated at Yale College, graduating in 1838. He immediately entered the Yale Law School, then under the distinguished care of Judge Hitchcock, and in 1840 established himself in the practice of the law at Berlin, Conn. Hardly had he entered upon business before his attention was strongly impelled to the subject of personal religion, and after passing through an interesting experience, he resolved to devote himself to the work of the ministry.

In 1841 he entered the theological department of Yale College, and, leaving it in 1843, he was ordained over the church in Middlebury, Vermont, July 17, 1844. He married Grace Ingersoll Hawley, October 8, 1844. He remained at Middlebury till compelled by failing health to leave, October 23, 1850. He commenced labor, with but a Sabbath's interval, in Danbury, Conn., where he was installed over the First Congregational Church, December 3, 1850, and continued as pastor until May 3, 1864, his strength having again given way under his unbroken toil. From this time he declined any permanent settlement, though often solicited to become a pastor. Residing four years at Ridgefield, Conn., where the family of his wife had their ancestral home, he supplied the church there, and in effect did a pastor's work till 1868. This was the same church, and worshipped in the same building, in which his maternal grandfather, Rev. Samuel Goodrich, officiated as pastor for twenty years half a century previous. After another period of illness, during the spring and summer of 1869, he was so far improved in health as to preach six months with great acceptance in the Second Presbyterian Church in Cleveland, O. On his return eastward he was seized with paralysis at his brother's in Yonkers, N. Y.; and on his partial recovery he came to his sister's in New Haven, where the disease from which he had long suffered — Bright's disease — finally terminated his useful and laborious life.

Mr. Coe was a singularly clear thinker, and master of a terse and vigorous style. His training in the law gave a perceptible flavor to his preaching, and made it especially acceptable to men of that profession. He toiled severely in

his preparation for the pulpit, never aiming at mere rhetorical effect, but striving to present the truth in forms vivid and impressive. In this he succeeded remarkably. Few preachers held an audience in so close a grasp. It was impossible to hear him even casually without being impressed; and to those who listened to him habitually his teaching became a spiritual necessity; to many it was the power of God unto salvation. Not a few condensed sentences which fell from his lips live indestructible in the memories of those who once heard them. The message he delivered was enforced also by a modest and winning piety. He was felt instantly and everywhere to be a man of God. No thought of cant ever associated itself with him. Never flinching in his Master's service, he was personally retiring, and of sweet and gentle manners which won universal love. Irreligious and sceptical men, once thrown in his company, were attracted to him as a friend and teacher. His presence in the community was felt to be a blessing; and his separation from any people, even after the labor of but a few months, always called forth heartfelt regret. Had he spared himself some excess of toil, he might, perhaps, have longer served the Church below. But he knew no stay in Christian labor; he looked more on the things of others than on his own, and was worn out in his prime. He leaves a widow, two sons, and a married daughter. His venerable father, now past fourscore years, also his brother and sister, share their grief.

W. H. G.

Mrs. MARY (RICHARDSON) McCLENNING, wife of Rev. Daniel McClenning, died at Peterboro', N. H., January 16, 1870, aged sixty-nine years.

She was born in Dublin, N. H., December 22, 1800, and was daughter of Abijah and Elisabeth (Richardson) Richardson. She was married to Rev. D. McClenning, March 28, 1837. For several years a cancer had been eating away her life, but she bore with a patient spirit all the pain incident to her disease.

In a state of great feebleness and prostration she repaired with her husband to their son's residence at Peterboro', where, after a few weeks' of suffering, she entered into rest.

So have closed the labors of a loving wife and praying mother, but her works follow her.

Although especially devoted to the interests of her family, yet she manifested a spirit of earnest consecration to the welfare of others, and deep devotedness to the cause of Christ; and by her counsels and prayers she greatly encouraged her husband in the several fields of his successful ministerial labor.

By the sweetness of her disposition and humility she endeared herself to those who became acquainted with her, and her memory will ever be fragrant with such as recount her labors to do them good.

She loved the Sabbath school and prayer-meeting, and retained her post in them to the last. One of her last acts of public worship was at a prayer-meeting at her own house, after she was too feeble to leave her bed.

Her communion with her Saviour, during the long painful days of her sickness was sweet and supporting, and she passed away in hope of a glorious resurrection unto life eternal.

G. D.

## LITERARY REVIEW.

THREE volumes have been received by us on kindred themes as unlike in their style and general character as could well be imagined. They are "*Pater Mundi*," "*Principles of a System of Philosophy*," and "*Causation and Freedom in Willing*." We will notice them in the order in which we have mentioned their titles.

The laudatory notices which had been given of "*Ecce Cælum*" led us to anticipate in the reading of "*Pater Mundi*,"<sup>1</sup> by the same author, a rich treat; but we are sorry to say that we were disappointed. The book is not without merit. It shows a good degree of industry in the study of science, and extensive reading in various directions. It reminds us of the epithet which Professor Stuart was fond of applying to Dr. Adam Clark, — "a literary scavenger." The design of the work is to draw from modern science proof of the being and character of God. With this design we are in full sympathy, and for all in the book which sets forth the evidence on this subject we are thankful; but we cannot say that the argument as presented is to our minds satisfactory or conclusive. The first effort of our author, and that which he enters upon with the greatest apparent zeal, is to place Theism and Christianity on the same footing with modern science, and to test their claims by a similar "experimental method." In this effort we think he has failed. We are familiar with the argument addressed to believers, derived from experience, and it is a sound one. The results of faith serve to confirm us in its exercise. Answers to prayer stimulate us to continuance in earnest and importunate pleading. A disposition to do the will of God prepares us to appreciate the evidence as to what is his will. But the argument of our author is addressed to the unbeliever as well as to the believer, otherwise he does not put God and Christianity on the same ground with science. And to tell the unbeliever to test the existence of God by prayer, while unbelieving, is to require of him an impossibility; for the prayer must have an element of faith in it in order to be genuine.

After quoting the promises to "the liberal soul," our author says, "Now, unbeliever or weak believer, make an experiment. Be liberal and see whether these promises are not fulfilled to you." (p. 17.) The spirit to which he here exhorts is that which the Saviour rebuked in the Jews, when he said, "A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign." Moreover, for a person to attempt to be liberal as "an experiment" to see whether the promise will be fulfilled is an impossibility, for his act would not embrace the essential elements of liberality. This is repeating in another form the proverb, in its delusive sense, that "Honesty is the best policy." If pursued as a policy, it ceases to be honesty.

Our author betrays a consciousness of this fallacy in his argument, for in the

<sup>1</sup> *Pater Mundi*; or, Modern Science testifying to the Heavenly Father. Being in Substance Lectures delivered to Senior Classes in Amherst College. By Rev. E. F. BURR, D. D. In two volumes. Vol. I. Boston: Nichols and Noyes. 1870. pp. 294.

latter portion of it he drops all allusion to unbelievers, and applies the argument only to "our weak-faithed selves" and to "men of scant faith."

The true position is that even the unbelievers, whom our author addresses, have instinctive wants and moral preceptions already, which as a basis of obligation constitute a legitimate ground for appeal, and they should be exhorted to heed their obligations at once, to cease to be unbelievers. When they become believers then can they begin to learn from experience. Until they do thus yield to a present consciousness of duty; for them to offer a tentative prayer to see whether there be any God is not praying to God, but rather tempting God. If asked whether we do not admit that there may be an honest atheist, we reply, If there be one under the light of Christian civilization, he knows the truth of what he does not believe, and his knowledge is the basis of obligation. But to ground the argument on instinctive wants and on the demands of the conscience is departing from the basis on which natural science rests, and our author sometimes, sliding into this legitimate mode of reasoning, vitiates his own theory as to the "experimental method."

The omnipotence of God furnishes a presumption that if he were infinitely good he would keep evil out of the world. This presumption we do not see, as our author distinctly recognizes, and hence he has not met it by any rebutting presumption. His argument from the fact that there are more joys than sorrows in the world may afford evidence that God is not as malicious as he might be; but this striking the balance between good and evil is a poor argument for infinite goodness. Had the learned author given more attention to psychology and logic, we think he would have constructed a sounder argument, and given us a clearer and more consistent philosophy.

As to style, we would not exclude from the scientific treatise the charms of rhetoric or the force of the imagination, but we do think this work is overloaded with fancies and with the airs of pedantry. And we would especially commend to the author the following declaration of the master of poetry, William Cullen Bryant: "I have often said that I found the English tongue sufficiently copious for my purposes."

THE new work entitled "*Principles of a System of Philosophy*,"<sup>1</sup> is composed of four parts. "1st. The Original Forces. 2d. Of the Possibilities. 3d. Applications to Theological Questions. 4th. Application to the Infinite, the Ideal, the Question of Progress, and like matters." The object of the writer is to show that there are laws of Necessity, which, as forces, limit the power of God both to do and to know, and hence that the existence of evil does not militate against the character of God, since he does as well as he can. The work is written with great simplicity and clearness, but it is open to the following objections:—

*First.* We have no evidence that what are here called "the laws of Necessity" have the positive "force" ascribed to them. The position that some things

<sup>1</sup> *Principles of a System of Philosophy*, in Accordance with which it is sought to reconcile the more Difficult Questions of Metaphysics and Religion with themselves and with the Sciences and Common Sense. By AUSTIN BIERBOWER, A. M. New York: Carlton and Lanahan. 1870. pp. 240.

are not objects of power is familiar to all able thinkers of the present age. All that is essential to the perfection of the divine character is, that God should adopt the *best* possible system of creation and government. The exclusion of evil from the *best* system, by the Creator and Governor, may not be an object of power, and if not, then its existence does not militate against his character. This argument is sound, safe, and reverential. But our author, not satisfied with this negative form of statement, speaks of "laws of Necessity" and of their "force." This *positive* form of statement seems to us unwarrantable. The word "law" is used with great latitude, as the learned Duke of Argyle has ably shown, and yet we question the desirableness of applying the word to Necessity, as is done in this work. And we more than question the propriety of attributing positive "force" to any such "law."

*Second.* While our author gains vividness of impression by his positive forms of statement, he involves himself in at least the apparent difficulty of vindicating the moral attributes of God at the expense of his natural attributes, and leaves the impression that there is by necessity an impotent God. Thus he says: "We have seen that God is not omnipotent, omniscient," etc. Here he fails to recognize the true meaning of the word "omnipotent," which is power to do every thing which is an object of power.

*Third.* He represents man in his sphere and degree as a "creator." We object to this use of language. It was Satan, in Eden, who essayed to teach our first parents how they could "be as gods"; and we do not believe in representing man, even seemingly, as in any way encroaching upon divine prerogatives.

While open to these objections, the book is profitable for some orders of mind, as a quickener of thought.

"CAUSATION AND FREEDOM IN WILLING"<sup>1</sup> is the title of a book composed of two letters addressed to John Stuart Mill, and two papers on the Existence of Matter and our Notions of Infinite Space. It is a very able book, — far the ablest of the three which we have classed together. The argument against the necessitarian theory of Mill we regard as conclusive. We agree with the author, that every moral being determines his own volitions, and that the fact of his determining them involves freedom. This form of statement seems to us much preferable to "the self-determining power of the will." It is free from the objections which may be urged against representing the motive as determining the volition. It is not inconsistent with the idea that the circumstances and susceptibilities of the individual render it *certain* that he will determine his volitions as he does. The author's power of analysis is very remarkable, and his command of language wonderful, especially when it is considered that he has spent his life under the cares and burdens of extensive mechanical and mercantile pursuits. While we accord this high merit to his work, we cannot give unqualified assent to all his positions. His definitions of terms are not always authorized by usage, and his classifications of acts are sometimes peculiar. He represents man as the subject

<sup>1</sup> Two Letters on Causation and Freedom in Willing, addressed to John Stuart Mill, with an Appendix on the Existence of Matter, and our Notions of Infinite Space. By ROWLAND G. HAZARD, Author of "Language," "Freedom of Mind in Willing," &c. Boston: Lee and Shepard. 1869. 8vo. pp. 300.

of wants, and as having knowledge of how these wants may be supplied, and that volition is an effort to supply these wants; hence he defines "the faculty of will" as "simply a faculty or ability to make effort." (p. 82.) The objection to this definition is, that it suggests an executive form of volition, and does not seem to include immanent acts. He says: "All the relations of the affections, including disposition, inclination, desires, habits, and motives to effort, are concentrated in knowledge and want." (p. 196.) "There may be conflicting inclinations, desires, or aversions, among which we must, by the preliminary examination, make our choice." "Choice being the knowledge (or belief) that one thing suits us better than another, this relation is that of a form of knowledge to action." (pp. 186, 187.) And again: "Choice belongs to the domain of knowledge, and not to that of the will. The effort to choose is only an effort to obtain the knowledge of what will suit us best." (p. 252.) This definition and classification of choice are certainly peculiar. If all writers should take such liberty with language as this, we could have no common standard of interpretation. Although this author has sharp powers of discrimination, yet he sometimes fails to exercise them. Thus he combats the idea of power of contrary choice, or of "ability to do the contrary," and in doing so says: "Our freedom in willing is evinced in our willing what we want to do, and it cannot be necessary to this freedom that we should be able even to try to do what we do not want to try to do." (pp. 133, 134.) It does not seem to have occurred to him that the word "want" is ambiguous, denoting sometimes an instinctive feeling, and sometimes a voluntary act; and that he is indebted to this ambiguity for the apparent force of his argument. In every case of choice there are competitive objects of desire, competitive instinctive wants, and the moral being who chooses determines which of the two he will have or do. Whichever he may choose, he may properly be said to choose in accordance with his wants, and his power to determine his choice involves the power to choose either.

Our author goes to an extreme which the accomplishment of his main object does not require or involve, when he exalts man to the position of "a creator," and says: "There seems to me good reason for at least a doubt as to whether the foreknowledge of the future determination of an intelligent being is always possible."

But how much soever we may differ from some of his subordinate positions, we welcome his book as a valuable tribute to mental science. His incidental confutation of the position of naturalists, that the sun rises eight minutes before we can see it, is laconic and irrefragable, and may well teach materialistic minds to respect the powers engendered by metaphysical speculations.

ALL who appreciate able and vigorous discourses will take pleasure in the volume of Sermons<sup>1</sup> furnished the press by Rev. Thomas Binney, D. D. We would that there were an American reprint of it at a price favorable to its general circulation. The volume embraces eighteen sermons preached at different intervals, during a period of forty years. The titles are as follows: 1. The Words of Jesus, and what underlies them. 2. Experience and Hope conserva-

<sup>1</sup> Sermons preached in the King's Weigh-house Chapel, London, 1829 - 1869. By T. BINNEY. London: Macmillan & Co. 1869. New York: 63 Bleeker Street. 8vo. pp. 384.

tive of Faith. 3. Life and Immortality brought to Light by the Gospel. 4. The Blessed God. 5. Men in Understanding. 6. Natural and Revealed Religion. 7. Salvation by Fire, and Salvation in Fulness. 8. The Divine Life in Man. 9. Regeneration and Renewal. 10. Principles to be remembered. 11. The Closet and the World. 12. Watchfulness and Work. 13. The Law our Schoolmaster. 14. The Creed of St. Paul. 15. Rationalism at Corinth. 16. An Old Year Meditation. 17. Buying and Selling, a Week-Day Homily. 18. A Forty Years' Review.

We would gladly give an analysis of some of these discourses, did our limits allow. There is no attempt at fine writing, but there is a calmness and dignity in the presentation of truth which bespeak a mind conscious of its grasp of the subject, and of its ability to meet the occasion. Some of these sermons are splendid specimens of didactic preaching. The thoughts are often compactly and impressively presented. It seems strange that the sermon on "The Words of Jesus, and what underlies them," and that entitled "Buying and Selling, a Week-Day Homily," could have been the product of the same mind, they are in such contrast in style. The latter seems like a familiar counting-room talk. Whether by "A Week-Day Homily" we are to understand that it was preached on a week-day, or that it concerns week-day affairs, it was surely peculiarly appropriate to a "Weigh-house Chapel." In the "Forty Years' Review" the author displays comprehensive powers, and an ability to condense into a small compass a view of the different themes which had during this period engrossed the public mind. It would have been instructive had he entered more minutely into his own experience, as the pastor of a metropolitan church. Any one who ever saw the majestic form and genial face of the author, and heard the pathetic and yet commanding tones of his voice, as he read these discourses, will at least excuse the extravagance of one of Mr. Binney's admirers, who remarking, "Mr. Binney preached a poor sermon last Sabbath," added, "but poor as it was for him, it was by far the most eloquent sermon which was preached in London that day."

"THE EMPHATIC DIAGLOTT"<sup>1</sup> is a curiosity in its line, as may be imagined from its title-page, which reads, "The Emphatic Diaglott: containing the Original Greek Text of what is commonly styled the New Testament (according to the Recension of Dr. J. J. Griesbach), with an Interlineary Word-for-Word English Translation: A new Emphatic Version, based on the Interlineary Translation, on the Renderings of Eminent Critics, and on the Various Readings of THE VATICAN MANUSCRIPT, No. 1209, in the Vatican Library. Together with Illustrative and Explanatory Foot-Notes, and a Copious Selection of References, to the whole of which is added, A Valuable Alphabetical Appendix. By Benjamin Wilson." This formidable "title-page" may well be regarded as a title-page and table of contents combined. Much labor has evidently been bestowed on the work, and we commend it as an aid in the study of the sacred record. The placing under each Greek word, so far as is possible, its equivalent in English is a specialty of peculiar interest. While thorough scholars will not need this "pony," there are many rusty students who will find it a great convenience.

<sup>1</sup> The Emphatic Diaglott. New York: Samuel R. Wells, No. 389 Broadway. 1870.



THE thanks of Christian scholars are due to Messrs. Scribner & Co. for their issue of a new edition, in cheaper form, of Dean Stanley's fascinating and scholarly Lectures<sup>1</sup> on the History of the Jewish Church and of the Eastern Church. The study of ecclesiastical history, shedding light on the sacred Word, and affording aid in the solution of theological difficulties, is encouraged and stimulated by such rich volumes as these. Dr. Stanley has shown himself worthy to rank with Ewald and Milman in this line of historic researches, and his graceful and graphic power of delineation will continue to win public attention and popular favor. We have no sympathy with his "Broad Church views," and we regret that these works should be marred by the expression of them; but we are not blind to the true merits of his writings, and while abating somewhat for the trouble of blowing away the chaff, we will give him full credit for the wheat. We trust an appreciative public will render largely remunerative this endeavor of an enterprising firm to place valuable historic treatises within the reach of men of moderate means.

It is quite needless to commend Miss Phelps's last book, — "Hedged In."<sup>2</sup> It will find readers from all quarters, and good may be derived from its perusal. It is a "novel," of course, but is intended to bring to view a phase of Christian character not often seen, and all the more to be admired when made so conspicuous. "Nixy," who at last found "God's folks" in Mrs. Purcell and her daughter Christina, was a native of "Thicket Street," a child of ignorance, poverty, and crime. She was confined with a child — "an' not turned sixteen" — in a miserable den, filthy and crowded; and from fear of being carried to the "sylum," escaped to the streets with her child, not three weeks old, and wandered about from house to house, seeking a refuge, until she felt compelled to lay it on the door-steps of a stranger's house, and then pursued her journey, offering her services everywhere, until she reached the Christian home of Margaret Purcell. The trials of Mrs. P. on finding her real situation, — which was not disguised, — the final triumph, of Christian principle, her struggles with her neighbors, her joy over the recovery of the fallen one, &c., &c., are all strikingly, beautifully, and in the main naturally, described. We are of the opinion that "Dick" was hardly competent to conceive some of the ideas ascribed to him; and we decidedly object to the strong term of "remorse" as expressive of Nixy's sufferings in her latter days, in view of her sin. Grief, or regret, or sorrow is not remorse. See Rom. viii. 1. The subject is a delicate one, and is treated with all the delicacy the most fastidious could ask.

HE who enters "the domain of Brain, Nerve, and Mind" expecting to find and to be able to educe fixed laws, or by the closest scrutiny of their phenomena

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church. Part I. Abraham to Samuel. Part II. From Samuel to the Captivity.

Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church, with an Introduction on the Study of Ecclesiastical History. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D. D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870. In three volumes, 8vo. pp. 572, 656, 551. \$2.50 per vol.

<sup>2</sup> Hedged In. By ELIZABETH STUART PHELPS. Boston: Fields, Osgood, & Co. 1870. pp. 295. \$1.50.

to do more than suggest their possible reduction to something like system, will find himself on "debatable ground," or rather on a great sea of uncertain currents and subject to variable winds. And yet we heartily welcome any judicious and efficient effort in this very important direction. A thoroughly educated and observing physician has great advantages in his professional work for this very kind of research. Dr. Elam has shown himself capable, in his "*Physician's Problems*,"<sup>1</sup> of producing a very able and suggestive book. Let judges, lawyers, physicians, ministers, and magistrates read and ponder well both the reasonings and the great array of facts which the book contains. These are grouped under the following headings, viz.: Natural Heritage; On Degenerations in Man; On Moral and Criminal Epidemics; Body v. Mind; Illusions and Hallucinations; The Demon of Socrates; The Amulet of Pascal; On Somnambulism; Revery and Abstraction; Notes. In the third chapter, on Moral and Criminal Epidemics, the author starts with this "problem": "Are mental affections and tendencies contagious like bodily diseases? If so, under what conditions?" This is a very interesting and instructive chapter. The reader will be surprised to find that every age has had its delusions, and not wonder that the present is by no means exempt. He refers to Mahometanism, the Flagellants or Whippers, the Dancing Mania, Witchcraft, Mormonism, Spiritualism, Infanticide, Suicide, &c., &c. The remedy the author suggests is a "sound form of Education, secular and religious, — *Education*, we say, not *Instruction*." But this is a book to be *studied*, and it is worthy of it.

THE Lectures of Father Hyacinthe upon "*The Family and the Church*,"<sup>2</sup> have been for some time before the public. The noble stand he has taken against some of the more daring and palpable errors of his Church, and the anathemas which have been hurled against him for this reason, have awakened a deep interest in the man, in his present anomalous position, as well as in whatever he may have written. His late visit to this country has tended to deepen and extend this interest. For these reasons the book before us will secure readers. The lectures are characterized by brilliancy, great fervor, and have passages of impassioned eloquence. They contain much truth with less error than would be expected from his ecclesiastical relations. He is a devoted Papist; and this fact is quite sufficiently apparent in this much-lauded book. It has an introduction of forty pages by Mr. Bigelow, and contains the remarkable letter of Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans, to his clergy, on the proposed definition of the Dogma of Infallibility in the Œcumenical Council.

MISS BEECHER has certainly met a great want by her "*Principles of Domestic Science*."<sup>3</sup> If good housekeeping can be conducted on Scientific Principles, we

<sup>1</sup> *A Physician's Problems*. By CHARLES ELAM, M. D., M. R. C. P. Boston: Fields, Osgood, & Co. 1869. pp. 400. \$1.50.

<sup>2</sup> *The Family and the Church*. Advent Conferences of Notre Dame, Paris, 1866–67, 1868–69. By the Rev. FATHER HYACINTHE, late Superior of the Barefooted Carmelites of Paris. Edited by LEONARD WOOLSEY BACON, with an Introduction by JOHN BIGELOW, Esq., late Minister of the United States at the Court of France. New York: G. P. Putnam & Son. London: S. Low, Son, & Marston. 1870. pp. 343. \$1.50.

<sup>3</sup> *Principles of Domestic Science*; as applied to the Duties and Measures of Home.

think she has found and set them forth in a way to reach and benefit those for whom they are especially intended. She gives plans for houses, for furnishing and occupying them; for cookery in detail; for work and diversion; for making money and using it; for discipline of mind, body, and soul. We wish the book was in every family that can read the English language. Many things which Miss B. has written in the past are good, but we think in this work she has excelled them all.

THE tenth volume of the *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*<sup>1</sup> is before us, and is full to the brim of the statistics, obituaries, and other important facts relating to the work and ministers of Panpresbyterianism in this country. It is adorned with three fine engravings of deceased ministers. The great labor and expense of compiling and publishing such a book are not appreciated, it is sad to say, by those who very much need to know the facts it contains. Posterity will thank the patient and self-sacrificing author.

FROM the Carters we have an able and interesting book on the Divine Person and Work of the Holy Ghost.<sup>2</sup> The argument is drawn alike from the Old and New Testaments. We have seen it nowhere so clearly and convincingly presented. Some passages, we think, are unnecessarily pressed into the service, and the aid of doubtful testimony is not needed. The chapters are, — The Witness of Scripture; The Distinct Personality of the Holy Spirit; The Eternal God-head of the Holy Spirit; The Holy Spirit anointing the Son of Man; The Spirit the Author of Holy Scripture; The Holy Spirit striving with the World; The Holy Spirit quickening the Soul to Life; The Holy Spirit sanctifying the Believer; The Issue of the Holy Spirit's Work.

WE noticed with approval "The Notes with Illustrations" of the four Gospels, by the Rev. Israel P. Warren, in the tenth volume of the *Quarterly*, page 50. We now have the Acts of the Apostles by the same writer, bound with the Gospels, and also separately. So far as we have examined the last work, we are persuaded that it has all the valuable qualities of the first, and together they make as good a commentary<sup>3</sup> as can be found in so few and well-chosen words. The Practical Thoughts are suggestive, common sense, useful. Sabbath-school teachers will find this a very helpful book. It has fifty-seven engravings, and an Alphabetical Index.

A Text-Book for the Use of Young Ladies in Schools, Seminaries, and Colleges. By CATHERINE E. BEECHER and HARRIET BEECHER STOWE. New York: J. B. Ford & Co. 1870. pp. 390. \$2.00.

<sup>1</sup> The *Presbyterian Historical Almanac and Annual Remembrance of the Church*, for 1868. By JOSEPH M. WILSON. Vol. X. Philadelphia: Joseph M. Wilson. pp. 428. \$3.00.

<sup>2</sup> The *Spirit of Life; or, Scripture Testimony to the Divine Person and Work of the Holy Ghost*. By E. H. BICKERSTETH, A. M. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers. pp. 192. \$1.00.

<sup>3</sup> The *Sunday-School Commentary. The New Testament, with Notes, Pictorial Illustrations, and References. Vol. I. The Gospels and Acts*. By ISRAEL P. WARREN. Warren and Blakeslee. pp. 518. \$1.75.

THE Gospel of Matthew<sup>1</sup> has found an earnest expounder, and we think, in the main, a very good one, in the Rev. N. M. Williams, and we predict a good sale for his book through the tact and skill of his enterprising publishers. The author is a Baptist, and interprets the passages in dispute on the subject of Baptism from his own stand-point, with all the candor that could be reasonably expected. The book has nineteen well-executed illustrations. Its chronology is intended to be minute and clear. It is placed at the head of the notes of each chapter, as Matt. xxiv. : "783 U. C. Tuesday evening, April 4, A.D. 30." While the notes may not be too full for critical and careful students of the Bible, it is a question whether this work could not, without material detriment to nine tenths of those who ought to have it, be reduced to one half its present compass. The same fullness on the whole New Testament would place the work beyond the reach of the many. This, however, is a question for the author and his publishers to settle.

WE can most heartily commend the *Life of our Lord*<sup>2</sup> by Dr. Hanna. The volume before us embraces only his earlier years. It opens with "the Annunciation, Mary and Elizabeth," and closes with the "First Sabbath in Capernaum and First Circuit of Galilee." There are eighteen Lectures in this volume, which is to be succeeded by five others of probably equal size. This volume is without Preface, Introduction, or Index. It seems to be the aim of the author "to unfold the sacred Individuality of Christ, in its unique glory, as that is seen in the successive incidents of his human life." These are happily and consecutively brought together as they are found in the four Gospels. The prophecies of the Old Testament which refer to Christ's coming and work are very happily introduced. If the coming volumes fulfil the promise this one gives, we shall have a very useful and interesting work. Every minister and every intelligent Christian would be instructed and profited by its careful perusal.

MESSRS. SCRIBNER & Co. have issued the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth volumes of Froude's *History of England*,<sup>3</sup> embracing *The Protectorate, The Fall of the Protector, The Reformed Administration, The Execution of the Duke of Somerset, Northumberland's Conspiracy, Queen Jane and Queen Mary, The Spanish Marriage, Reconciliation with Rome, The Martyrs, Calais, and the Reign of Elizabeth down to 1567.* This work, so thorough and graphic, increases in interest as it advances, and will not, we trust, be in want of readers among those who appreciate English history as the common inheritance of the American people.

DR. W. W. HALL has favored the public with a new volume under the title of "*Health by Good Living.*"<sup>4</sup> The title of the chapters — *The Object of Eating,*

<sup>1</sup> The Gospel according to Matthew; with Notes: intended for Sabbath Schools. Families, and Ministers. By NATHANIEL MARSHMAN WILLIAMS. With Illustrations. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1870. pp. 332. \$1.75.

<sup>2</sup> The Earlier Years of our Lord's Life on Earth. By the Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, D. D., LL. D. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers. 1870. pp. 400. \$1.50.

<sup>3</sup> *History of England, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.* By James Anthony Froude, M. A. New York: Popular edition. \$1.25 per volume.

<sup>4</sup> *Health by Good Living.* By W. W. HALL, M. D., Editor of *Hall's Journal of Health*, &c. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1870. 12mo. pp. 277.

When to Eat, What to Eat, How much to Eat, Regularity in Eating, How to Eat, Biliousness, Dyspepsia, Neuralgia, Nervousness, The Unity of Disease, Air and Exercise, Food Cure, the Argument, and Rest — will give an idea of the character of the work. Our physicians have long enough devoted themselves exclusively to the cure of disease. We welcome any efforts on their part for its prevention. We cannot but feel that the general circulation of this book would raise very much the average health of the community.

ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, with whose good books the public are familiar, have issued "Words of Comfort for Parents bereaved of Little Children; edited by William Logan, of Glasgow, Scotland," a compilation of the writings of many distinguished divines. (12mo. pp. 337.) Also a small volume, entitled "Removing Mountains, — Life Lessons from the Gospels; by John S. Hart." New York. It is composed of scriptural narratives in simple and agreeable form. (12mo. pp. 306.)

"THE QUESTION OF THE HOUR: The Bible and the School Fund. By Rufus W. Clark, D.D.," issued by Lee and Shepard, Boston, is a manly defence of the Christian character of our institutions, and an able presentation of the argument in favor of the Bible as an unsectarian book, and as essential to the proper moral tone of our educational institutions. We wish it might have a general circulation.

"CHURCH WORK" is a suggestive little volume, published by the Congregational Sabbath School and Publishing Society. Under the various departments of Teaching, Religious Meetings, Service of Song, Christian Neighborhood, Hidden Service, and Miscellaneous Efforts, it seeks to systematize Christian labor for the upbuilding of the Church and the salvation of mankind. We especially commend what is said on the importance of *Christian hospitality*. What we greatly need at the present time is to have every church make its influence felt as a *working force*, and we are happy to welcome this little book as a help in securing so desirable an end.

"HENDERSON'S COMMENTARY ON EZEKIEL"<sup>1</sup> reaches us just as our last pages are going to press, and we therefore make but brief reference to it, although we should like to give an extended notice. The previous works of the same author (Commentaries on the Minor Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, &c.) have made him familiar to our biblical students, and he is justly considered one of the most trustworthy expounders of Holy Writ. In this volume he seems especially cautious "not to load the inspired text with the cumbrous lucubrations of his own imagination," not to force upon it or its interpretation any preconceived ideas or theories, and he claims that the vein of historical reality running through the book seems as a safeguard against mystical vagaries. He is also careful not to go beyond what is written, not to attempt to explain what the Lord did not intend to reveal. Admitting that obscurities attach to the Book of Ezekiel, he queries whether these are not, to a great extent, attributable to the mists of false explanations rather than to mysteries thrown around the book by

<sup>1</sup> The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, translated from the Original Hebrew. With a Commentary, Critical, Philological, and Exegetical. By E. HENDERSON, D. D., author of Commentaries on the Book of the Minor Prophets, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Isaiah, &c. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 8vo. pp. 228. \$2.25.

the prophet himself. One position taken by Henderson is worthy of notice; he argues that Ezekiel's pictures must be taken as "wholes," and not in their minor details, and, in illustration, says that minute attention to the detailed description of the Temple, apart from a grand view of the whole, is a principal cause of the difficulty attending its interpretation. He says that "while constrained to abide by the idea of a literal temple," "he sees no violation of the laws of sound exegesis in maintaining at the same time the symbolical import of the structure and its ordinances, just as we understand the typical character of the former temple erected by Solomon."

The volume is issued in the excellent typography characteristic of Mr. Draper's publications.

As a writer of elegant and scholarly prose James Russell Lowell has few equals; as an essayist we rank him first among our authors. His poetry is enjoyable to a high degree, except in its too studied moods, as in some portions of "The Cathedral"; but his prose so well stands the test of every phase of criticism, that we give it the preference. And then he is not afflicted with the desire, so over-strong in American writers, to appear before the public frequently. He is one of the few who write at leisure, and with care. The volume recently published<sup>1</sup> contains six essays, which originally appeared in the *North American Review*, but which we rejoice to see have experienced a resurrection from that literary sepulchre. Not that we underrate the *Review*, but its readers are so few, that we feel sometimes as if good articles were buried in it. These essays are: (1) Dryden, (2) Witchcraft, (3) Shakespeare once more, (4) New England Two Centuries ago, (5) Lessing, (6) Rousseau and the Sentimentalists. We do not agree with every opinion expressed in these essays; we regret that occasionally Mr. Lowell seems to feel it his duty to give a stroke, usually more keen than fair, at New England theology; yet in the main he is just, and we think he means to be. What there is in the atmosphere to taint with rationalism so much of our literature that would otherwise be so thoroughly satisfactory is a question, and we are not sure but that there are signs of a purification in the literary heavens. Lowell is patient in his studies, and generally careful in his conclusions. Thus in the essay on "Witchcraft" he deals candidly with the Puritans, and shows that they were not "sinners above all others," but that the belief in diabolic agency was at that time general, and that the trials in Salem, instead of being, as is persistently charged by unfair writers, exceptionally cruel, "were in fact, if compared with others of the same kind, exceptionally humane"; and he pays a warm tribute to the "efficacy of Puritanism in the character and conscience," which he well says "may be allowed to outweigh a great many sneers at Puritan fanaticism," and the lesson he draws is "charity for others, distrust of ourselves." In the essay on "New England Two Centuries ago" he gives a picture which is well worth studying, but we can quote only one sentence as indicative of his views and his mode of expression: "Faith in God, faith in man, faith in work, — this is the short formula in which we may sum up the teaching of the founders of New England, a creed ample enough for this life

<sup>1</sup> Among my Books. By JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, A. M., Professor of Belles-Lettres in Harvard University. Boston: Fields, Osgood, & Co. 12mo. pp. 380. \$2.00.

and the next." As a specimen of Lowell's epigrammatic style, we note this: "Talent is that which is in a man's power; genius is that in whose power a man is." There may be a clearer discrimination than this, but we have not seen it. After these remarks, which we could easily extend, had we space, it is superfluous to say that we recommend the book; if the hints we have given are not sufficient to set our readers to examining its pages, no amount that we could write would do so.

"HAGENBACH'S HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES"<sup>1</sup> is a very valuable, although prolix work, but not exactly in the line of its title. It is rather a tracing out of religious opinions outside of the Roman Catholic Church, and the consideration of them in their changes and developments as converging to a common result. It has been remarked by some critics that his real subject might be called with propriety "the development of Protestantism," and this is true with the one exception that he seems to be ignorant of, or to regard as of no importance, the progress of religious thought outside of his own Germany. Thus of twenty-two lectures in Vol. I., one is upon France, one upon Methodism, one upon Swedenborg, and the remainder are given to Germany and Switzerland; in Vol. II., of twenty lectures there is only one on Protestantism outside of Germany. Hagenbach is evangelical, and he is very charitable toward all who differ from him, and aims to find for all variations of religious speculation some justifying cause, and evidently holds to the idea that mental activity and progress are inseparable. Thus he would not restrict criticism or hinder inquiry. He considers the beginning of the eighteenth century as a dividing line between widely differing eras in religious history. A period of wars, persecutions, and radical revolutions was then succeeded by an age of toleration, when Romanism and Protestantism seemed to hold an "armed truce," and to husband their resources and develop their beliefs in practical ways. An era of intellectual activity began with the nineteenth century, and the current from that time has flowed stronger, wider, and deeper. The Reformation let loose the pent-up powers of the Middle Ages, and after the mighty convulsions naturally consequent had swept over the European nations, the genuine results began to appear, and from that time freedom of thought has been a fixed fact in its mental, moral, and spiritual exercises. In the author's delineations of the advance of Protestantism he makes a clear presentation of a radical difference between it and Romanism. The latter, whatever changes may come to its position in the world as a power spiritual or temporal, holds always the same list of characteristic dogmas; these know no change in number or meaning, while Protestantism, by its very nature, is both receptive and progressive, always seeking for new truth, always ready to discard error. Rome never acknowledges error, never finds new truth. Hagenbach's charity sometimes is in excess, as when he regards Strauss and Hegel, and others of the sceptical schools, as really leading men into truth. There is a sense in which this is cor-

<sup>1</sup> History of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. By K. R. HAGENBACH, D. D., Professor of Theology in the University of Basle. Translated from the last German Edition, with Additions by the Rev. JOHN F. HURST, D. D. Two volumes, 8vo. pp. xii, 504; vi, 437. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.



rect, for discussion tends to bring out truth, and the Bible and Christianity are to stand confirmed by the investigations of their opponents; but a wholesome condemnation of positive error and infidelity would give to the work a flavor that it now lacks. As a whole, this history is one to be studied with care and with profit, and the publishers deserve the thanks of our scholars for presenting it to them in so good a translation and so faultless typography. The natural prolixity of the German writers is largely compensated by their usual thoroughness of investigation and judicial conclusions, and we shall expect that Hagenbach's last work, now under notice, will take its place on the shelf beside his admirable "History of Doctrines."

"THE SUPERNATURAL ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY,"<sup>1</sup> by Professor Fisher, was noticed in the *Quarterly*, Vol. VIII. page 53. We are very glad that a new edition has been called for. This work deserves a wide circulation, and the needs of religious thinkers and teachers demand it. Never have the strongholds of our Christianity been more fiercely, ably, or persistently assailed than at the present day. Professor Fisher meets these assailants on their own ground, and in language and by arguments that are cogent and irresistible. The present edition of this great work has forty pages of supplementary notes, not contained in the first; but we regret to see that the index of the first edition is, strangely enough, omitted in the second. The Table of Contents gives the following topics, viz.: The Nature of the Conflict of Christian Faith with Scepticism and Unbelief; The Genuineness of the Fourth Gospel; Recent Discussions upon the Origin of the first three Gospels; Baur on Parties in the Apostolic Church and the Character of the Book of Acts; Baur on Ebionitism and the Origin of Catholic Christianity; The Mythical Theory of Strauss; Strauss's Restatement of his Theory; The Legendary Theory of Renan; The Critical and Theological Opinions of Theodore Parker; An Examination of Baur and Strauss on the Conversion of Paul; The Nature and Function of Christian Miracles; The Testimony of Jesus concerning Himself; The Personality of God in Reply to the Positivist and the Pantheist. To all but four of these sections there is a supplementary note, and some of these topics are discussed anew in the Introduction. The theme of this invaluable treatise is "the origin of the religion of Christ, whether it be from Heaven or of men." None could be more important or timely, and by no one has it been more fairly or ably treated than by Professor Fisher. We heartily commend his work to our readers.

A VOLUME of sermons by Rev. Stopford A. Brooke, the biographer of the late Rev. F. W. Robinson, recently reprinted in this country,<sup>2</sup> has met with such cordial welcome and almost unanimous indorsement from those who are not inclined to lend their names or opinions carelessly, that we may seem to affect a singularity

<sup>1</sup> Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity, with Especial Reference to the Theories of Renan, Strauss, and the Tübingen School. By GEORGE I. FISHER, D. D., Professor of Church History in Yale College. New and enlarged edition. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. pp. 620. \$3.00.

<sup>2</sup> Sermons preached at St. James's Chapel, York Street, London, by the Rev. STOPFORD A. BROOKE, M. A., Honorary Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. Boston. Fields, Osgood, & Co. 1869. 12mo. pp 323. \$2.00.

in differing somewhat from them in our estimate. It is only too true that membership or office in the English Church is no guaranty of theological soundness, but we apprehend that the simple fact that Mr. Brooke is "chaplain in ordinary to the Queen" has been taken by many as sufficient evidence of his evangelical belief. We cheerfully admit and admire the certain charm of style and not infrequent richness of thought met with throughout the book, the earnestness of the moral exhortations, the sweet sympathy with nature, and the boldness of the attacks upon sundry social evils, but we fail to find the clear perception or perhaps recognition, of some of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity; so much so, that a large portion of these sermons might come under the head of mild Pantheism. And when Mr. Brooke attempts to follow out a line of thought and argument in itself radically important, we feel an incompleteness that is uncomfortable, and suggestive of great vagueness on the part of the royal preacher. Thus, in discussing "the progressive development of our Lord in his Incarnation," he seems all the while to be portraying a sinless human being; the Divine personality is absent; and this, too, with an occasional recognition of the Divinity of Christ, just enough to insure a technical saving of the doctrine, but overlaid by a rounded phraseology that strips the doctrine of any practical force. Thus he says: "If we were forced to choose between two half-truths, between believing only in the divinity or only in the humanity of CHRIST, *there is no doubt* [the italics are ours] that to believe only in His humanity would be less destructive to Christian life and to Christianity than to believe only in 'His divinity.'" (p. 101.) But without the divinity of Christ, where is Christianity? The descent of the Holy Ghost upon Christ at his baptism is described as symbolical and not historical. Again, he says: "What has GOD done? He has conceived of the race as one man, and He has incarnated that idea in JESUS CHRIST, the sinless image of humanity. That sinless image He will fulfil in the race whom the SAVIOUR represented. All humanity shall be saintly, shall be CHRIST's, shall be GOD's, for CHRIST is GOD's. Then shall war be finished! then shall goodness be known to be that which it is, always triumphant; then shall man know that his experience of evil was but a shadow cast by goodness in the imperfect mirror of humanity." (p. 275.) And through the book we find, as is not uncommon in these days, our old-time Christian technology put to new uses. In fact, the Christianity, simple and pure and plain, of the New Testament, is sadly lacking in these sermons, and the lack is not compensated by the rhetorical beauties, or the moral arguments which abound. Of the good and strong points of the volume we do not speak; these are many and forcible; but our aim is to induce religious and thoughtful readers to discriminate between what *seems* and what *is*. Carried a little farther, the range of thought often taken by Mr. Brooke leads to a real rationalism cloaked in the garb of the religion of Christ.

WE have entered in earnest upon a new field of literature, — the discussion of the relations of Romanism to our republican institutions. In years past there have been temporary appeals through the press on the general subject, which died out with their immediate causes; but now the case is different. At first, under the guise of conscientious objection to the reading of the Bible in our public schools, and then, more openly, in a direct attack upon our school system, the

Romanists have begun contests which will know no abatement until the question is settled whether a free Bible and free schools<sup>1</sup> are essential and indispensable characteristics of our institutions.

In the warfare against Bible-reading in our schools, the Romanists have the sympathy and aid of nearly all the foreign element in our population; while some Protestants and intelligent American citizens seem, for the time, to be bewildered by the plausible demand of right of conscience, as if Protestant conscience was of no account, as if all the conscience that is to be regarded belongs to those who have at heart the recasting of our government in the mould of Old-World Romanism, or rationalism: In Cincinnati, as our readers are aware, the question has been brought to a practical issue in the Superior Court; and although an appeal has been taken to the Supreme Court, the arguments *pro* and *con*, and the opinions of the judges, are of sufficient importance to warrant their publication in a large octavo volume. The direct point was to decide whether, under the constitution of Ohio, the common schools of that State could be secularized. The decision was that they could not; that Christianity, not in the sense of ecclesiasticism, is the prevailing religion; that "the framers of the Constitution felt that the moral sense must necessarily be regulated and controlled by the religious belief, and that whatever was opposed to religious belief estimated by a Christian standard, and taking into consideration the welfare of the state, would be, in the highest degree, opposed to the general public sense, and have a direct tendency to undermine the moral support of the laws, and corrupt the community; and in a republic like ours these would be fatal to it." We do not see how any citizen, especially any public preacher or teacher, can afford to be without this book under notice. Its careful perusal will show the chief points on both sides of the main question at issue, and will prepare for a careful consideration of the other and imminent question of the very existence of our common-school system. In Cincinnati the point was solely upon Bible-reading, and the labored arguments in this volume bear mainly upon that; but that attack was merely on the pickets, and perhaps was prematurely brought on by the too zealous Romanists and their friends in evil counsel. The Catholic press now is unanimous in its bold claims for sectarian schools, for a division of the public funds; and here is where the conflict is to come. It is the duty of every conscientious citizen to inform himself on the great subject, and to that end we commend this volume. Aside from its immediate interest, it has an historic value not easily over-estimated. It is printed and bound in beautiful style.

"THE BIBLE TEXT CYCLOPEDIA"<sup>2</sup> is one of those books by the use of which it is easy to appear to advantage, by leaning upon the downright hard work of others. The world will never know how much it has been indebted to Cruden!

<sup>1</sup> The Bible in the Public Schools. Arguments in the case of John D. Minor *et al.* v. The Board of Education of the City of Cincinnati *et al.* Superior Court of Cincinnati, with the Opinions and Decisions of the Court. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 8vo. pp. 420. \$2.50.

<sup>2</sup> The Bible Text Cyclopædia. A Complete Classification of Scripture Texts, in the Form of an Alphabetical Index of Subjects. By Rev. JAMES INGLIS. 1st American from 7th English edition. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 8vo. pp. 524. \$3.00.

Without his masterly work, compilers and editors of text-books in the past and the present generations would oftentimes have come to grief. We are sometimes apprehensive that familiarity with passages of Scripture on certain topics common in religious experience comes from some text-book rather than from a faithful reading of the Bible. We believe much in "commentaries," in "aids," in "text-books," but we believe vastly more in the Bible, and we would not have books *about* the Bible take the place *of* the Bible. Of the many books which we own and which we have examined of the general class under notice, we like this the best, although, as we write this clause, we think of Simmons's excellent "Scripture Manual," and hesitate. Mr. Inglis, the author of this work, new to the American public, claims that in it every subject will be found which has a place in the Bible, and he says he has *attempted* to discover *every* text belonging to each topic. He has done remarkably well in this respect, but we have yet to see the book where such attempt has been wholly successful, and even here, it is easy to call to mind texts not to be found under their appropriate heads. The alphabetical arrangement is good, and the choice of titles, one of the most difficult tasks, is very satisfactory; bewildering subdivisions have been judiciously avoided, and an abstract of doctrinal and practical subjects appended to the book adds much to its value. The volume is a model of typographical excellence, and the fact that it has passed through seven editions in England is good evidence that it has unusual merit. Pastors and all students of the Bible will find it useful, and its judicious study will materially lighten labor.

J. B. FORD & Co. have issued in very good style a volume of "Lecture-Room Talks,"<sup>1</sup> a series of familiar discourses on themes of general Christian experience, by Rev. Henry Ward Beecher. To many minds these "Talks" will have more practical value than systematic sermons, from the fact that they abound in personal experience. We have felt in the lecture-room of Plymouth Church the rare charm and real value of Mr. Beecher's "talks" with his people, and have been benefited by them; and as we see them scattered broadcast through the land, and now gathered in a volume for a renewed circulation, we feel that they are a power for good. And with this thought comes another: What responsibilities rest upon a man whose every utterance in the pulpit, on the platform, and in the papers of the day is read by so many thousands! What care should be exercised that only that which is elevating, purifying, Christianizing, should be said or written! Upon what other man now before the people do such responsibilities rest? and while mistakes are human, who will dare to assert that he can meet them more faithfully than Mr. Beecher?

"BREAK UP" is the last and the best of the Lake Shore Series. Perhaps that is all that need be said to commend this stirring, thrilling book to the multitudes who now so eagerly read all that Oliver Optic writes. — "Fergus Morton," published by the Carters, a story of a Scottish boy, by Dr. Macduff, is well told, and is a very clever book. — Numbers XXIII. and XXIV. of Smith's Bible Dictionary are issued, having reached the word "Priest." We never consult this great work without a deeper impression of its inestimable worth, and the wish

<sup>1</sup> Lecture-Room Talks: A series of Familiar Discourses on Themes of General Christian Experience. By HENRY WARD BEECHER. Phonographically reported by T. J. Ellinwood. New York: J. B. Ford & Co. 12mo. pp. 378. \$1.75.

that every reader and lover of the Bible might have the benefit of it. (Hurd and Houghton.)—"The Botanist and Florist" is a new work by Alphonso Wood, treating the subject under four parts, as Structural, Physiological, Systematic, and Descriptive Botany. It is the result of life-long labors in classifying the scientific facts of which it treats, and is designed as a complete manual, recording and defining nearly four thousand species. (A. S. Barnes & Co.)—"The Two Granddaughters," by Mrs. J. D. Chaplin, issued by the American Tract Society of Boston, is a neat 12mo volume, entertaining in its style, illustrated, and excellent in its moral and religious influence.—"Bible Gems, a Manual of Scripture Lessons," by R. E. Kremer, seems to us a well-arranged and useful book for Sunday schools and families. It has no sectarian bias, but is evangelical in its treatment of Bible truths, systematic in the progression of subjects, and comprehensive in its scope. In size it is convenient, in typography unexceptionable, in its aim correct, and in its execution satisfactory. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.)—Another excellent book from the same publishers is "Words in Season," a manual of instruction, comfort, and devotion, adapted both for family reading and private use. The readings and selected subjects are interspersed with devout prayers, and the whole intent of the book is to lead those in need of consolation to Him alone who can give it. Wholesome introspection, as opposed to morbid faith, submission, abiding trust, and cheerful hope, are set forth in an earnest, spiritual manner, and the careful and prayerful perusal of the little volume can be productive only of good.—Mr. Draper, of Andover, sends us a good reprint of Archbishop Whately's "Essays on some of the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion," with his famous tract, "Historic Doubts relative to Napoleon Bonaparte," appended. These writings of Whately will always have a certain interest, although their time of highest value has passed. As specimens of close and curious reasoning, they still hold a high place, and their perusal would doubtless strengthen the faith of many a vacillating mind.—Without entering into detail, we desire to call attention to the "Illustrated Library of Wonders," in course of publication by Charles Scribner & Co., of New York. For cheap, attractive, and valuable treatises on subjects of practical value, we know not their equal. Occasionally there may be a tripping on some scientific subject when discoveries have not been brought down to the latest dates, or when the English author has ignored the results of American scholarship, but, as a whole, the series is worthy of high praise, and its price (\$1.25. per vol.) is so low that its circulation should be very great.—"Modern Evangelism" is discussed in a calm but earnest manner by Rev. W. W. Davenport in a pamphlet, which he sends us, published by Nichols and Noyes. After examining the subject in the light of the Bible and experience, he reaches the conclusions, (1) that the tenor of Scripture does not encourage the employment of evangelists in our churches; (2) that the pastor has no right to delegate the spiritual direction of his charge to other hands; (3) that it tends to the disparagement of the pastoral office and work; (4) that the Scripture indications of the Divine plan and arrangement respecting the work of a local church—which exclude evangelism—should bind the conscience as an authoritative guide; (5) that the effect of the system upon the churches is injurious; (6) and finally, that the system dishonors the Holy Spirit. Of the practical importance of the subject

no one can doubt, and we think that the author of this pamphlet has in a compact and clear manner presented views which should be thoroughly considered by ministers and churches and evangelists. — "The Manual of the Church of Christ in Framingham, Mass.," is, in many respects, a model. It has, in addition to the standard documents and lists, condensed historical notes in chronological order, so that the whole history of the church is presented in a compact and intelligible form, while a good index shows that the compiler, Rev. I. H. Temple, knew his business, and did it. — Twenty volumes have been issued (1850 to 1870) of the "Annual of Scientific Discovery," a work which has earned and holds a place among our standard authorities. Its title exactly covers the scope of the work, and, as a continuous record of progress in the various departments of Science and Art, it has no rival. The current volume seems to us to be edited with more than usual care, its arrangements to be better, its selections more discriminating. The introductory pages by the editor are valuable, and in themselves make a compend of information, a condensed statement of facts, that place the reader abreast of the great events of the past year, in scientific research. Professor Trowbridge, of the Institute of Technology, is the editor of this volume, assisted by Dr. Kneeland and W. R. Nichols, of the same Institute. A fine steel portrait of Professor Benjamin Peirce, of the Coast Survey, makes an appropriate frontispiece. (Boston: Gould and Lincoln.) — Gould and Lincoln are publishing a new and uniform edition of the long and favorably known writings of Rev. Nehemiah Adams, D. D. "Agnes and the Little Key" and "Catharine" have already been issued in an attractive style, and we hope and believe will start anew on their mission of love and consolation to thousands of afflicted hearts. In the whole range of Christian literature we know of no books more tender, touching, more imbued with the spirit of Christ, or better fitted to soothe the sorrowing, and turn the heart to God in a trustful love. The Christian public long ago gave this indorsement to these beautiful books; they will never grow old, and so long as the angel of death plucks the buds and blossoms from our household gardens, so long as there is the weeping of separation from those who have gone over the river before us, so long as the yearning soul is in the shadow of affliction, — so long will these books be read and prized. — From the same publishers we have "Crowned and Discrowned," a well-wrought narrative of Saul, in which the incidents in the life of the rebel king are used as illustrative and confirmatory of important spiritual lessons of practical and perpetual application. It is a good book for the family, or for Sunday schools. — The Congregational Sabbath School and Publishing Society (what's in a name!) have recently issued two attractive books for Sabbath schools and family reading, entitled "White Robes" and "the Island Home." We are especially interested in the fact that this same society will publish immediately the admirable course of lectures on Christianity and Scepticism, delivered in this city the past season. The book will be valuable and timely, and we hope to see it very widely circulated. The names of the lecturers, and the subjects they discussed, are sufficient to establish the character of the book. An advertisement on another page will give interesting details of its contents.

## EDITORS' TABLE.

CONGREGATIONALISM has often been disparaged as wanting in centralized power. We maintain that it is its excellence and its glory that it is free from such power for ecclesiastical domination. Does it need greater centralization for Christian work? On this point we may appeal to history. Where is there a denomination which has done more than the Congregationalists for Education, for Morals, for Missions, or for general benevolence? Congregationalism has been defined as "sanctified common sense." If there is evident demand for united action, some way is devised for securing it. When there was occasion to bring the churches of the East and of the West together for conference, a call was issued by direction of the General Association of New York, and the "Albany Convention" assembled in 1852; and the beneficent influence of that assemblage has been felt through the whole denomination ever since. When there was occasion for a National Council, a representative convention of the Congregational churches in the Northwest expressed a desire that it might be called. Whereupon the Trustees of the American Congregational Union convened a Conference of State Committees in November, 1864, which Conference arranged the preliminaries, and the Council met in 1865. Thus one of the most important meetings which was ever held by any ecclesiastical body in the United States was happily and triumphantly consummated.

As it seemed appropriate and desirable to have special memorial services on the two hundred and fiftieth year since the Pilgrims landed in this New World and here established Christianity in its primitive forms, the old Church of Plymouth, Mass., issued its call, and a preliminary Convention met in New York on the 2d of March, and the arrangements for such an observance of the year are now in progress. Thus we see that Congregational churches can act unitedly whenever there is real occasion for their doing so.

The action of the recent Convention in New York is in several respects noteworthy. The idea is sometimes advanced that our voluntary organizations for benevolent operations have not a sufficiently direct connection with our churches, and are not, so far as is desirable, responsible to them. The fear is even sometimes expressed that they may in some way prove oppressive to the churches.

It is in this connection a notable fact, that, of the thirty-five persons who composed the recent convention, sixteen were sent there by these voluntary societies; five others were individually in the employ of such societies, and of the remaining fourteen at least six had some official connection with them, and yet no one of the benevolent societies, which make annual appeals to the churches for support, was presented to the churches, or recommended for special contributions during this year; and although the Convention was in session nearly all the time from ten o'clock in the morning until after ten o'clock at night, and a great number of motions were put to vote, yet there was not a negative vote given in a single instance.

After such a demonstration, who will say that Congregationalists cannot concentrate their power and act in unison?



AMONG the curiosities of the day we find a tract issued by "The Church Press Company of Hartford, Conn.," under the title "What a Congregationalist can say of the Protestant Episcopal Church," consisting of "a Lecture delivered in the Opera House, Elmira, New York, by Rev. Thomas K. Beecher."

The *first* argument which he offers in favor of the Episcopal Church is, that it is "a reformed Church, and not revolutionary." "This reformed Church of England filled up nearly three hundred years in her work of purifying and simplifying." A curious argument this! As though the fact that the Church of England was "nearly three hundred years" in breaking away, even to the extent to which she did, from the errors and corruptions of Rome, was more to her credit than it would have been to have accomplished this work in a shorter period!

The *second* fact adduced in her favor is, that she "offers for our use the most venerable liturgy in the English tongue." He implies that the Episcopal Church has no advantage in this regard over the Roman Catholic Church, except that the "devotional treasures" of the latter are "embalmed and buried in Latin." It would seem, then, an easy mode of attaining to merit to furnish an English translation of the Roman Catholic Prayer-book.

His *third* position is, that "The Episcopal Church preserves a very high grade of dignity, decency, propriety, and permanence in all her public offices." Under this idea of "public offices" he enumerates the use of the prayer-book, infant baptism, confirmation, marriage and burial service. We were not aware that the Scriptures gave any special prominence to these "public offices," or insisted that it was of fundamental importance to sustain a high grade of "dignity, decency, propriety, and permanence" in them. In alluding to the "words" "spoken over one's own grave as over the thousand times ten thousand of them who have slept in Jesus," he fails to recognize the fact that the *same words* have been spoken over the graves of those who gave no evidence that they "slept in Jesus"!

His *fourth* appeal is to Apostolic succession, stating that "The Episcopal Church furnishes (to all who need such comfort) the assurance of an organic and unbroken unity and succession from Jesus Christ through the Apostles by a line of Authentic Bishops." By throwing in the parenthetical sentence "to all who need such comfort" he implies that such comfort is not one of the essential wants of human nature, and then to the few who think they need it he makes the damaging admission that he "cannot decide" "absolutely" whether this "assurance of an organic and unbroken unity" is reliable.

His *fifth* argument is, that "The Episcopal Church is excellent in her provisions for Christian education and pious drill." To sustain this position he adduces the conclusive fact that the Episcopal Church has adopted substantially the calendar of the Roman Catholic Church as to Fast and Feasts. This "pious drill" consists, in no small measure, in the observance of Saints' days!

His *last* argument is that this Church does not require assent to the Creed of the Church as a condition of membership. He makes no allusion to the results of this depreciating doctrinal belief, as seen in the factions which now threaten to rend the organic unity of this Apostolic Church!

The Scriptures teach "Ye shall know them by their fruits." To this test Mr.

Beecher makes no allusion. The matter of "fruits" does not seem to have engaged his attention.

We do not wonder that his arguments failed to convince him that it was either his duty or privilege to join the Episcopal Church; we do wonder that the publishers imagined that their friends could derive much comfort from these small crumbs from a Congregational table.

Not satisfied with presenting considerations favorable to the Episcopal Church, he indulges in attacks upon those who do not use a Prayer-book. Thus he says: "In nearly every newspaper you may read some funny story based upon the ignorance or eccentricity or blasphemous familiarity of some extemporizing prayer-maker." We wonder where among his acquaintances he finds those whose eccentricities furnish the largest supply of funny stories!

He adds, "All of you here present have been at some time shocked or bored by public devotional performances." *Query*, Was he addressing those who were accustomed to attend upon *his* ministrations?

THE CATHOLIC WORLD for the current month, in an article on the School Question, gives to the Congregationalists the credit of taking the lead in educational matters. It says this: "It is to the credit of the American people that they have, — at least the Calvinistic portion of them, — from the earliest colonial times, taken a deep interest in the education of the young. The American Congregationalists and Presbyterians, who were the only original settlers of the eastern and middle colonies, have from the first taken the lead in education, and founded, sustained, and conducted most of our institutions of learning. The Episcopalians, following the Anglican Church, have never taken much interest in the education of the people, having been chiefly solicitous about the higher class of schools and seminaries. The Baptists and Methodists have, until recently, been quite indifferent to education. . . . Even the Presbyterians, while they have insisted on a learned ministry and the education of the easy classes, have not insisted so earnestly on the education of the children of all classes as have the Congregationalists; and, indeed, it is hardly too much to say that our present system of common schools at the public expense owes its origin to Congregationalists and the influence they have exerted. The system, whatever may be thought of it, has undeniably had a religious, not a secular origin. The system originated in New England, strictly speaking, in Massachusetts. As originally established in Massachusetts, it was simply a system of parochial schools." This is a strong tribute from an adverse party. The author is right in his statement of historic fact; but it is not true that our present common-school system is in any sense parochial, — and it is the present system, not the past, which is involved in the issue now before the American people.

This Roman Catholic writer, in noticing the proposition to solve the school difficulty by excluding from the public schools whatever is distinctive of any particular denomination, and introducing only our common Christianity, says: "This would, perhaps, meet the difficulty, if the several denominations were only different varieties of Protestantism. The several Protestant denominations differ from one another only in details or particulars, which can easily be supplied at home in the family, or in the Sunday school. But this solution is impracticable where the division is not one between Protestant sects only, but between Cath-

olics and Protestants. The difference between Catholics and Protestants is not a difference in details or particulars only, but a difference in principle. Catholicity must be taught as a whole, in its unity and its integrity, or it is not taught at all. It must everywhere be all or nothing. It is not a simple theory of truth or a collection of doctrines; it is an organism, a living body, living and operating from its own central life, and is necessarily one and indivisible, and cannot have anything in common with any other body."

When he says Catholicity "is not a simple theory of truth or a collection of doctrines; it is an organism, a living body, living and operating from its own central life," he must, as it seems to us, have acted on the theory that "it is the design of language to conceal thought," or must have felt himself so hard pushed that he had in fact no thought to conceal.

The closing part of his sentence, that Catholicity "cannot have anything in common with any other body," as the authoritative statement of the organ of the Catholic Church, we would especially commend to the attention of those who imagine that any slight modification of our school system will conciliate the Romanists; and also to the attention of those who think the Church of Rome is so really Christian and so nearly right that it needs only to be "reformed," and who would deprecate any action in relation to it, from within or from without, which should be "revolutionary."

This Roman Catholic writer further adds, "But we are asked, 'What shall be done with the large body of citizens who are neither Catholic nor Protestant?' Such citizens, we reply, have no religion; and they who have no religion have no conscience that people who have religion are bound to respect." This surely is summary and cavalier, not to say dramatic.

The fact that in this country we have no union of Church and State has led some Protestants to leap to the conclusion that the State has no right to insist on sustaining a Christian position, as though the divorce of Church and State led logically to the necessity of the State being established only on naturalism. If the separation of Church and State obliges us to exclude the Bible from our schools, whenever a portion of our citizens demands it, then, on the same condition, it obliges us to exclude the Bible from the reformatory institutions of the government, and all religious elements from our school-books, prayer from our Congress and our State legislatures, oaths from our courts, and the enforcement of the Sabbath from our statutes. Moreover, on this theory, we must suspend all governmental interference with the polygamy of the Mormons, and, as a government, never recognize God, or any principles of morality which are based on revealed religion. Who does not instinctively recoil from such deductions of logic run mad? Discarding organic union between Church and State does not logically turn us over to the cold and deathly domain of naturalism. And we think that we can rely on the good common sense of the people to see that the rejection of the one extreme does not necessitate the adoption of the other. It may be difficult to draw the line and tell what we may and what we may not enforce; but because it is difficult it is not therefore impossible. The exact location of the dividing line may perhaps be properly varied somewhat in different communities, or at different periods of time, but it does not follow from this that there is to be no line; and if we mistake not, we see indications in the public mind of a grow-

ing firmness of disposition to maintain Christianity as part and parcel of our common law.

JOHN ALDEN AND PLYMOUTH ROCK. — Rev. John A. Vinton sends us historical memoranda relating to "The Landing of the Pilgrims," from which we make some extracts which will throw light upon an historic event, and perhaps dissipate some of the romance hitherto surrounding it. He says, "In an obituary notice of a deceased clergyman, not long since, it was said, 'He was a lineal descendant of John Alden, known in the history of the Pilgrims as the youth who first leaped upon the Rock at Plymouth.' Being myself 'a lineal descendant of John Alden,' and as strongly inclined as any one to maintain his right to honors which are justly his due, I am nevertheless constrained by the respect due to authentic history to say that the tradition here referred to, and which has been repeated with undoubting confidence perhaps thousands of times, is utterly without the least foundation.

"The facts touching the 'Landing of the Pilgrims,' as we have them in 'Mourt's Relation,' are these. The company, of one hundred and one persons, who came in the Mayflower to Provincetown harbor, November 11, 1620, O. S., after sending out two exploring parties, and being dissatisfied with their reports, despatched a third party to find, if possible, a fit place for settlement. This party left the Mayflower in a shallop, on Wednesday, December 6, answering to December 16, New Style, and consisted of the following individuals: Myles Standish, John Carver, William Bradford, Edward Winslow, John Tilley, Edward Tilley, John Howland, Richard Warren, Stephen Hopkins, Edward Doten; being, as the account says, 'ten of our men, who were of themselves willing to undertake it.' Besides these, were two hired seamen, John Allerton and Thomas English, Clarke, the master's mate, and pilot of the Mayflower, Robert Coppin, the gunner of the vessel, and three common sailors, — seventeen in all. This party, after exploring the inner shore of the peninsula of Cape Cod, found themselves on Friday evening under the lee of Clark's Island, in Plymouth harbor. Having on that day encountered a severe storm, and broken the mast of their shallop, they stayed all Saturday on the island to refit. They also spent the next day, the Sabbath, on the island, although the weather was inclement and time was precious. On Monday, December 11, answering to December 21 of the New Style, they landed on the Rock of Plymouth, not to make a settlement, as is commonly supposed, but to see whether the place was fit for a settlement to be made. What did they on that day? 'On Monday we sounded the Harbour, and found it a very good Harbour for our shipping; we marched also into the Land, and found divers corne fields, and little running brookes, a place very good for situation, so we returned to our ship again with good news to the rest of our people, which did much comfort their hearts.' In other words, they examined Plymouth harbor and its shore, from Eel River, in Plymouth, to Jones River, in Kingston; decided on this as the place for settlement, and on the following day, Tuesday, December 12, in their shallop, struck across the bay to the Mayflower, still in Provincetown harbor, a distance in a straight line of about twenty-five miles.

"Let it be carefully noted: 1. That no landing was effected on what is now proudly called 'Forefathers' Day,' except for the purpose of exploration.

2. John Alden was not of the company who landed on Plymouth Rock on said Forefathers' Day. 3. Mary Chilton was not of that company, nor any other woman, and so that romantic story about her landing has no foundation. 4. The Mayflower did not come into Plymouth harbor till Saturday, December 16 (26). 5. The Mayflower continued in that harbor at anchor, from that time all winter long, without landing her entire company. For, 6. The company of the Pilgrims, especially the women and children, abode in her the greater part of the time, except those who were employed in putting up buildings on the shore, and these seem to have returned to the vessel every night. 7. The 'Landing' was not completed till Wednesday, March 21, corresponding to the last day of that month by our present reckoning.

"It is far from my thoughts to disparage the 'Landing of the Pilgrims.' It was a most memorable event, entitled to all the consideration which has ever been given to it. But there was no such affair as has commonly been imagined to have taken place on the 21st or 22d of December, 1620. Sargent's picture of the 'Landing,' which now hangs in Pilgrim Hall, in Plymouth, and the engravings copied from it, represent a *myth*, a mere fancy, and wholly mislead the beholder.

"John Alden the ancestor of nearly all who bear the name in this country, and of a still greater multitude bearing the names of Adams, Bass, Copeland, Delano, Peabody, Sampson, Standish, Thayer, and I know not how many more, was born in England about 1599, and died in Duxbury September 12, 1687, aged eighty-eight. He was not of the Leyden Church, but joined the company of the Mayflower at Southampton, where the ship stopped for supplies. He was probably the youngest of those who signed the immortal compact of civil government in the harbor of Provincetown, November 15, 1620, as he was certainly the last male survivor of that glorious company. He was almost constantly in public employment, and was a man of sound wisdom, of great integrity, and high moral worth."

JUST as the last few pages of this number are going to press, we receive the sad intelligence of the death of the Rev. Theron Baldwin, D. D., Corresponding Secretary of "The Society for the Promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education at the West." It will be remembered that the last number of the Quarterly contained a valuable historical article from his pen. He was preparing another article for our pages on "The Philosophy of the Pilgrims," which we fear has been left incomplete. Dr. Baldwin was a remarkable man, and was privileged to do a glorious work. For clearness of insight, soundness of judgment, accuracy and thoroughness of research, order and system in working, constructive ability and executive force, when shall we see his like again?

The College Society, of which he was the Father, and the colleges which have received its fostering care, are his monument, more resplendent than any tablet or statue at Westminster Abbey, or the sarcophagus under that massive dome in the rear of the Hotel des Invalides.

## CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY RECORD.—1869-70.

## CHURCHES FORMED.

1869.

AUSTIN, Kan., July, 29 members.  
 FAIRVIEW, Ill., Sept., 8 members.  
 LAKE SIMONETT, La.  
 LOCUST LANE, Io. (German), Dec. 30, 10 members.  
 MONTGOMERY, Ala., Plymouth Ch., Dec. 13, 14 members.  
 PORTAGE RIVER, Sept. 10.  
 SCHUYLER, Neb., Dec.  
 St. LOUIS, Mo. (Eileardville), Plymouth Ch.  
 TOLEDO, Ohio.

1870.

BEDFORD, Mo. (near), Feb. 10, 10 members.  
 BLAIR, Neb., 8 members.  
 BROWNSVILLE, Tex., 8 members.  
 BURLINGTON, Io., Feb. 24, The Olivet Cong'l Ch., 16 members.  
 CARTHAGE, Mo., Jan. 5.  
 CORNING, Io., Jan. 9, 7 members.  
 DUDLEY, N. C., March 9, 16 members.  
 EASTON, Wis., Jan. 23, 7 members.  
 GARDEN PRAIRIE, Io., Feb. 8.  
 HARTFORD, Conn., New North, March 23.  
 LOMBARD, Ill., Jan. 20.  
 PAWNEE CITY, Neb., 7 members.  
 PLYMOUTH, Kan., 12 members.  
 SOLSBERRY, Ind., Jan. 23.

## MINISTERS ORDAINED.

1869.

EASTON, DAVID A., over the Ch. in Danbury, Conn., Dec. 29. Sermon by Rev. Edward L. Clark, of New Haven.  
 HART, HENRY B., over the 2d Cong'l Ch. in Deer Isle, Me., Dec. 21. Sermon by Rev. Alfred E. Ives, of Castine. Ordaining Prayer by Rev. Hiram Houston, of Deer Isle.  
 MATSON, —, to the work of the Ministry, Greenville, Mich., Nov. 23.  
 NOBLE, MASON, Jr., over the Ch. in Sheffield, Mass., Dec. 29. Sermon by Rev. Franklin Noble, of Brooklyn, L. I. Ordaining Prayer by Rev. Mason Noble, D. D., U. S. Navy.

1870.

BALDWIN, WILLIAM B., over the Ch., North Rochester, Mass., Jan. 18. Sermon and Ordaining Prayer by Rev. Henry B. Hooker, D. D., of Boston.  
 BURRAGE, HENRY S., over the Ch. in Waterville, Me.  
 CALLAN, M. J., to the work of the Ministry in Kingston, Mo., Feb. 10. Sermon by Rev. Samuel D. Cochran, D. D., of Kidder.  
 CRAGIN, CHARLES C., over the Ch. in Owatonna, Minn., Feb. 16. Sermon by Rev. James W. Strong, of Fairbault.  
 DENTONSON, JOHN H., over the Ch. in South Williamstown, Mass., Jan. 30. Sermon and Ordaining Prayer by Rev. Mark Hopkins, D. D., of Williams College.  
 DERING, CHARLES T., over the Ch. in Rosemond, Ill., March. Sermon by Rev. John K. McLean, of Springfield.

FRY, H. B., over the Ch. in Carthage, Mo., Jan. 5.  
 HALLEY, EBEN, over the 1st Cong'l Ch. in Cincinnati, O., Jan. 13. Sermon by Rev. E. Halley, D. D., of Albany, N. Y.  
 HOPKINS, Prof. ALBERT, to the work of the Ministry in Williamstown, Mass., Jan. 2. Sermon by Rev. Mark Hopkins, D. D., of Williams College. Ordaining Prayer by Rev. Nathaniel H. Eggleston, of Williams College.  
 MCELROY, E. P., to the work of the Ministry in Sinclairville, N. Y., Feb. 26. Sermon by Rev. M. E. P. Thompson, D. D.  
 NORCROSS, LANSON P., over the Ch. in Stockbridge, Wis., Jan. 26. Sermon by Rev. William Crawford, of Green Bay.  
 OWENS, JOHN T., over the Ch. in Nortonville, Cal., March 8. Sermon by Rev. Charles H. Pope, of Princeton.  
 PACKARD, EDWARD N., over the Ch. in Evanston, Ill., Jan. 13. Sermon by Rev. Franklin W. Fisk, D. D., of Chicago Seminary.  
 PIERCE, LEROY M., over the Ch. in Glenwood, Mo., Feb. 4. Sermon by Rev. Edwin B. Turner, of Hannibal.  
 REED, WILLIAM C., over the Ch. in South Dennis, Mass., Feb. 10. Sermon by Rev. Albert H. Plumb, of Chelsea. Ordaining Prayer by Rev. James E. M. Wright, of Newport, R. I.  
 SCOTT, JOHN, over the Ch. in Dudley, N. C., March 9.  
 SHERRILL, ALVAN F., over the 1st Ch. in Omaha, Neb., Jan. 5. Sermon by Rev. George F. Magoun, D. D., of Iowa College.  
 SHIPMAN, SAMUEL B., over the Ch. in Atwater, O., Jan. 13.  
 WILLISTON, MARTIN L., over the Ch. in Flushing, L. I., March 3. Sermon by Rev. Henry M. Storrs, D. D., of Brooklyn. Ordaining Prayer by Rev. Simeon S. Jocelyn, of New York City.

## MINISTERS RECEIVED FROM OTHER DENOMINATIONS.

BLANCHARD, Rev. G. P., of Paw-Paw, Mich.  
 CALLAM, Rev. J. M., of Kingston, Mo.  
 CHADDOCK, Rev. EMORY G., of Lawrence, Mass.  
 FAIRCCHILD, Rev. E. B., of Hinsdale, Mich.  
 HALEY, Rev. JOHN W., of Somerset, Mass.  
 MOREHOUSE, Rev. DARIUS A., of Lowell, Mass.  
 WELD, Rev. WILLIAM M., of Glencoe, Minn.

## MINISTERS INSTALLED.

1869.

GARRETTE, Rev. EDMUND Y., over the Plymouth Ch. in Pittsburg, Penn., Dec. 30. Sermon by Rev. Samuel Wolcott, D. D., of Cleveland, O. Installing Prayer by Rev. E. K. Squier, D. D.  
 KEDZIE, Rev. ADAM S., over the Ch. in Dexter, Mich., Dec. 22. Sermon by Rev. Jesse W. Hough, of Jackson. Installing Prayer by Rev. T. Towler.

1870.

ALLEN, Rev. ROWLAND H., over the Trinity Cong. Ch. in Neponset, Mass., Feb. 8. Sermon by Rev. William H. H. Murray, of Bos-

ton. Installing Prayer by Rev. Cyrus W. Allen, of East Jaffrey, N. H.

BOURNE, Rev. JAMES R., over the Ch. in West Rutland, Vt., Jan. 16. Sermon by Rev. Aldace Walker, D. D., of Wallingford.

BROWN, Rev. EDWARD, over the Ch. in Medford, Minn., Feb. 17. Sermon by Rev. Americus Fuller, of Rochester.

CHAPIN, Rev. L. D., in East Bloomfield, N. Y.

COGSWELL, Rev. JOSEPH S., over the Ch. in Holden, Me., Jan. 6. Sermon by Rev. Prof. William M. Barbour, of Bangor Seminary. Installing Prayer by Rev. James Wells, of Dedham.

CORWIN, Rev. ELI, over the Green Street Ch. in San Francisco, Cal., Feb. 1. Sermon by Rev. E. G. Beckwith.

DOWDEN, Rev. WILLIAM H., over the Ch. in Lunenburg, Mass., Feb. 2. Sermon by Rev. Jacob M. Manning, D. D., of Boston. Installing Prayer by Rev. Alfred S. Hudson, of Burlington.

HURLBURT, Rev. CALVIN B., over the Bellville Avenue Ch. in Newark, N. Y., Jan. 19. Sermon by Rev. Jeremiah E. Rankin, D. D., of Washington, D. C.

LADD, Rev. HORATIO O., over the Ch. in Romeo, Mich., Feb. 18. Sermon by Rev. Oliver S. Dean, of Kalamazoo.

MERRILL, Rev. E. W., over the Ch. in Cannon Falls, Minn. Sermon by Rev. Richard Hall, of St. Paul.

OFFER, Rev. CYRUS, over the Ch. in East Smithfield, Pa., March 8.

PALMER, Rev. EDWARD S., over the Ch. in Berkshire, N. Y., Jan. 9. Sermon by Rev. Edward Taylor, D. D., of Binghamton. Installing Prayer by Rev. Samuel Johnston, of Newark Valley.

PARKER, Rev. HORACE, over the Ch. in Pepperell, Mass., March 17. Sermon by Rev. Horace James, of Lowell. Installing Prayer by Rev. George H. Morse, of Townsend.

PARKINSON, Rev. ROYAL, over the Ch. in Temple, N. H., Jan. 13. Sermon by Rev. George B. Safford, of Burlington, Vt. Installing Prayer by Rev. Daniel Goodwin, of Mason, N. H.

POWELL, Rev. JOHN J., over the Ch. in Rio Vista, Cal., March 2. Sermon by Rev. Israel E. Dwinell, D. D., of Sacramento. Installing Prayer by Rev. James A. Daley, of Stockton.

SMYTH, Rev. NEWMAN, over the 1st Ch. in Bangor, Me., March 3. Sermon by Rev. George E. Adams, D. D., of Brunswick. Installing Prayer by Rev. Sewall Tenney, D. D., of Ellsworth.

THURSTON, Rev. PHILANDER, over the Ch. in Sudbury, Mass., Feb. 1. Sermon by Rev. Jacob M. Manning, D. D., of Boston. Installing Prayer by Rev. Henry J. Richardson, of Lincoln.

WILSON, Rev. JOHN G., over the Ch. in Saxton's River, Vt., Jan. 12. Sermon and Installing Prayer by Rev. Zedekiah S. Barstow, D. D., of Keene, N. H.

WOODWORTH, Rev. HORACE B., over the Ch. in Charles City, Io., Feb. 17. Sermon by Rev. Ephraim Adams, of Decorah.

#### MINISTERS DISMISSED.

1869.

ADAMS, Rev. FRANKLIN W., from the Ch. in Parma and Greece, N. Y., Dec. 2.

BARTON, Rev. ALANSON S., from the Ch. in Townsend, Vt., Dec. 13.

JAMES, Rev. WILLIAM A., from the Ch. in Chelsea, Vt., Dec. 30.

RAWSON, Rev. GEORGE A., from the Ch. in Batavia, Ill., Dec. 23.

SAVAGE, Rev. WILLIAM H., from the Ch. in Holliston, Mass., Dec. 31.

SMITH, Rev. ISAAC B., from the Ch. in Turner Junction, Ill., Dec. 15.

STURTEVANT, Rev. JULIAN M., Jr., from the Ch. in Hannibal, Mo.

WICKES, Rev. HENRY, from the Ch. in Deep River, Conn., Oct. 19.

1870.

BACON, Rev. LEONARD W., from the New England Ch., Brooklyn, N. Y., March.

BELL, Rev. NEWTON H., from the Ch. in Stafford Springs, Conn.

BILLINGS, Rev. RICHARD S., from the Ch. in Shelburne, Mass., March 15.

BURTON, Rev. NATHANIEL J., from the 4th Ch. in Hartford, Conn., March 14.

COOK, Rev. SILAS P., from the Ch. in Marlboro', N. H., Feb. 23.

DODD, Rev. STEPHEN G., from the Central Ch. in Middleboro', Mass., Jan. 11.

DOWDEN, Rev. WILLIAM H., from the Ch. in Carlisle, Mass.

FERRIS, Rev. LEONARD Z., from the Ch. in Pittsfield, N. H., Feb. 8.

GLIDDEN, Rev. N. DIMIC, from the Ch. in Easton Rapids, Mich., Feb. 10.

HILL, Rev. GEORGE E., from the Ch. in Saxonville, Mass., March 1.

HURD, Rev. PHILO R., from the Ch. in Romeo, Mich., Feb. 16.

LEAVITT, Rev. GEORGE R., from the Ch. in Lancaster, Mass., Feb. 3.

PARKER, Rev. HORACE, from the Ch. in Ashby, Mass., Feb. 4.

SANBORNE, Rev. GEORGE E., from the Ch. in Northboro', Mass., March 17.

TEWKSBURY, Rev. GEORGE A., from the West Ch. in Portland, Me., March 2.

TOMLINSON, Rev. J. L., from the Ch. in Chester, N. H., Jan. 18.

WHITTLESLEY, Rev. MARTIN K., from the Ch. in Ottawa, Ill.

WILCOX, Rev. ASHUR H., from the Ch. in Preston, Conn.

#### MINISTERS MARRIED.

1869.

CLIDE — COFFIN. In Centreville, Io., Oct. 26, Rev. J. C. Clide to Miss Martha H. Coffin.

DAVIS — STRONG. In Dundee, Ill., July 15, Rev. Jerome D. Davis, of Cheyenne, Wyoming Territory, to Miss Sophia D. Strong.

HILL — RAW. In Beloit, Wis., May 4, Rev. Dexter D. Hill, to Miss Louisa F. Raw.

MCLEAN — BELDEN. In Simsbury, Conn., Dec. 1, Rev. Allen McLean, of East Orange, N. J., to Miss Annie Belden, of Simsbury.

1870.

COGSWELL — HART. In Holden, Me., Feb. 23, Rev. Joseph F. Cogswell, to Miss Emma V. Hart, both of Holden.

CRAGIN — REMINGTON. In Foster, R. I., Rev. Charles C. Cragin, of Owatonna, Minn., to Miss Hannah E. Remington.

DICKINSON — BLISS. In Chicago, Ill., March 16, Rev. Samuel F. Dickinson to Miss Martha A. Bliss.

TENNEY — PARSONS. In Boston, Mass., Jan. 12, Rev. Henry M. Tenney, of Dorchester, to Miss Bessie Parsons, of Marion, Ala.

THOMPSON — DARTT. In Denver, Col., Jan. 1, Rev. Nathan Thompson, of Boulder, to Miss Mary E. Dartt, of Baraboo, Wis.



**WILLIAMS—BOCKINS.** In Philadelphia, Penn., Feb. 1, Rev. Moseley H. Williams, of Brooklyn, L. I., to Miss Emma V. Bockins, of Philadelphia.

**RIPLEY, Rev. ERASTUS,** in Somers, Conn., Feb. 21, aged 55 years.

**WESTON, Rev. JAMES,** in Standish, Me., Jan. 20, aged 78 years.

**WHEELER, Rev. MELANCTHON G.,** in North Woburn, Mass., Feb. 10.

#### MINISTERS DECEASED.

1869.

**HAWLEY, Rev. ZERAH K.,** in Memphis, Tenn., Dec. 28, aged 63 years.

**LEWIS, Rev. WALES,** in Pittston, Me., Dec. 26, aged 71 years.

**LITTLE, Rev. ELBRIDGE G.,** in Wellesley, Mass., Dec. 29, aged 52 years.

**MOTT, Rev. THOMAS S. W.,** in Catawba Co., N. C., Sept. 20.

**PERKINS, Rev. JUSTIN, D. D.,** in Chicopee, Mass., Dec. 31, aged 65 years.

**ROBINSON, Rev. EBENEZER W.,** in Washington, D. C., April 8, aged 57 years.

1870.

**BATES, Rev. DAVID,** in Westboro' Mass., Feb. 9, aged 84 years.

**BLAKEMAN, Rev. PHINEAS,** in Tonawanda, N. Y., aged 60 years.

**BLANCHARD, Rev. AMOS, D. D.,** in Lowell, Mass., Jan. 14, aged 63 years.

**BURGESS, Rev. EBENEZER,** in Newton Centre, Mass., Jan. 1, aged 64 years.

**CADWELL, Rev. CHRISTOPHER C.,** in Lamar, Mo., Jan. 16.

**DYER, Rev. DAVID,** in Albany, N. Y., Feb. 8, aged 59 years.

**FELTCH, Rev. JOSEPH H.,** in Cummington, Mass., Jan. 19.

**FOBES, Rev. EPHRAIM,** in Chrystal Plantation, Me., Jan. 11, aged 67 years.

**KEEP, Rev. JOHN,** in Oberlin O., Feb. 12, aged 88 years.

**PHELPS, Rev. JAMES,** in Chelsea, Mass., Jan. 28, aged 61 years.

#### MINISTERS' WIVES DECEASED.

1869.

**HAYES, Mrs. MARY D.,** wife of Rev. Gordon, in Ravenswood, Wis., Dec. 12.

**HODDLE, Mrs. —,** wife of Rev. Henry, in Liber, Ind., Sept. 18.

**PATCH, Mrs. —,** wife of Rev. Rufus, in Ontario, Ind., Dec. 2.

**SCHLOSSER, Mrs. —,** wife of Rev. George, in Paxton, Ill., Nov. 29.

1870.

**BEACH, Mrs. ELIZABETH R.,** wife of Rev. Nathaniel, in Providence, R. I., aged 64 years.

**BEECHER, Mrs. KATHARINE EDES,** wife of Rev. William H., in North Brookfield, Mass., Jan. 5.

**LORD, Mrs. ELIZABETH KING,** wife of Rev. Nathan, D. D., in Lowell, Mass., Jan. 30, aged 78 years.

**M'CLENNING, Mrs. MARY,** wife of Rev. Daniel, in Peterboro', N. H., Jan. 16, aged 63 years.

**PARMELEE, Mrs. NELLIE A.,** wife of Rev. Moses P., in Erzeroum, Turkey, Feb. 17, aged 30 years.

**SAVAGE, Mrs. NANCY M.,** wife of Rev. Daniel F., in Stoddard, N. H., March 12, aged 37 years.

**WORCESTER, Mrs. SUSAN D.,** wife of the late Rev. Samuel M., D. D., in Somerville, Mass., aged 68 years.

**WRIGHT, Mrs. MARTHA G.,** wife of Rev. Ephraim M., in Terryville, Conn., Feb. 6.

## AMERICAN CONGREGATIONAL ASSOCIATION.

It is known that the Congregational churches of this country are arranging to observe this, the Fifth Jubilee of the Landing of the Pilgrims, with some fitting public demonstrations, and with many fitting memorial offerings. It is hoped that every family and every individual who claims any respect for the founders of our Great Republic will signalize that respect in some tangible, useful way, by liberal gifts, according to their several ability. And while paying "church debts" and funding our Theological Seminaries are very important, and should be done, yet it must be apparent that if anything named, or to be named, has a higher claim than any other as to its immediate necessities, or as to its promise of present and ultimate good in vivifying and invigorating our denominational forces, or as to its fitness as a monument to the men whose memory we would cherish, whose principles we would honor, whose grand, noble, and heroic deeds we would emulate, and whose influence we would perpetuate even unto the latest generation, or as an expression of filial love and of loyalty to Him who guided our ancestors to these shores, *the building of the Congregational House at Boston, this year, has that higher claim.* It stands out clearly in the foreground as a necessity, and appeals to every one for — A GIFT, — be it smaller or larger, but A GIFT. The child ought to have a tile or a brick, and the man and the woman should have an ownership in such a structure.

It is urged, and indeed it is expected, that Boston and Massachusetts will give the most of the larger amounts that will make up the grand sum-total, and that the rest of New England will take a deeper interest in the building than the masses elsewhere; but all ought to have, and must want to have, a share and a name and a place in this memorial structure, — not an ideal, or dead, but a real, living monument, occupied from front to rear, from basement to rafters, with workers for Christ in furnishing a religious literature for our Sabbath schools and families, and as almoners of our churches' bounties through our various benevolent societies, and with books, pamphlets, portraits, engravings, manuscripts, and such-like, which illustrate the principles, polity, and history of those brave pioneers whom the good everywhere will more and more delight to honor.

Now, to meet the circumstances of all, so as to make it possible for every member of every Congregational church to become a Life Member of the Association, and thus a proprietor in all its estate, and entitled to all its privileges, library included, the payment of a sum not less than ONE DOLLAR at one time, guarantees all this; and for which a neat little certificate will be returned, on good bank-note paper, with an electrotype engraving of the Mayflower under full sail from Plymouth, England, and also in the offing of Plymouth Harbor, America, with the shallop nearing the shore, and a sturdy Pilgrim, with some lady-passenger in his arms, wading to the rocks, where two or three have already arrived, — altogether giving an excellent idea of those earliest scenes in our history.

We do, therefore, with great hope and boldness ask for Life Memberships from all our churches, — east, west, north, and south. It is the least they can think of doing, if they wish the perpetuity and unity of our churches. And there must be one or more in every church who would give five, ten, or twenty dollars to secure a Life Membership for every one in that church; so that by a little effort on the part of the pastor or some good worker in every church, our entire membership might be placed upon our records for posterity. Which of our three thousand churches will be the first to head our new book, by sending the ONE DOLLAR for every member to

ISAAC P. LANGWORTHY, *Cor. Sec. A. C. A.,*

MARCH 23, 1870.

40 Winter Street, Boston, Mass.

## AMERICAN CONGREGATIONAL UNION.

THE rapid increase in the number of Congregational churches since the triumph of Liberty in our land, involving the great extension of the denomination, is making more and more apparent the necessity of some means of intercommunication and of friendly offices between all the members of this great ecclesiastical family. Particularly do the old and the new, the strong and the weak, need to be brought into quick sympathy and co-operation. It was the design of the American Congregational Union to be the medium of this intercommunication, and to perform these friendly offices. The strong have honored it as the almoner of their bounty; the weak have gratefully acknowledged its efficient ministrations. The work of the Union has been constantly augmenting, and is gaining a wider and firmer hold upon the sympathies of the churches.

Since the statement made in the January Quarterly, the following appropriations have been paid :—

1st	Congregational Church, Wilton,	Maine,	\$ 500
1st	" " "	" (special)	750
1st	" " " Earlville,	Illinois,	450
	" " " Sharon,	Wisconsin,	500
1st	" " " Stockbridge,	"	450
	" " " Platteville,	"	500
German	" " " Dubuque,	Iowa, (balance)	200
Hickory Grove	" " " Marion,	" (Mount Pleasant P. O.)	200
	" " " Pleasant Mount,	Missouri, (balance)	100
1st	" " " Breckenridge,	"	300
1st	" " " Neosho,	"	500
1st	" " " Windsor,	"	400
1st	" " " Lebanon,	"	500
1st	" " " Hamilton,	"	400
Welsh	" " " Dawn,	"	200
1st Church of Christ,	" " Burlington,	Kansas,	350
1st Congregational	" " Oswego,	"	500
1st	" " Denver,	Colorado, (half loan) ;	1,000
			\$ 7,800

Within the ten months of the present financial year of the Union payments have been made to fifty-seven different churches, amounting to the sum of \$30,216.65. The receipts of the Union during this period have been \$32,180.56. Thirty-three churches have already received pledges of help, whose houses of worship are in process of erection, but the Union has not as yet the means of meeting their wants. In order that the Union may avail itself of the generous offer made by one person, to give \$5,000, if its receipts should reach \$50,000 the present year, it is earnestly hoped that within the remaining two months not included in this account (March and April), numerous and liberal contributions will be made to the Union by our churches and by individuals whom God has blessed with abundant means. Will not the descendants of the Pilgrims entering upon the celebration of the quarto-millennial year since their forefathers landed on Plymouth Rock and planted in this New World the seeds of a free Church and a Christian Republic, inaugurate their memorial services by consecrating the "first fruits"—a "wave offering"—to the noble work in which the Union is engaged? What could be more accordant with the spirit of the Pilgrims?

Rev. RAY PALMER, D. D., *Corresponding Secretary*,  
49 Bible House, New York.

Rev. C. CUSHING, *Corresponding Secretary*,  
16 Tremont Temple, Boston, Massachusetts.

N. A. CALKINS, *Treasurer*, 146 Grand Street, New York.





*Jos. Abbott*

